THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

In America there is going on as a result of a revived interest in religion a movement among those competent for the task aimed at attaining a re-statement of effective theology. In Europe—so it was alleged at Evanston—thinkers are tired, not yet refreshed and vigorous after the ordeal of the World Wars, which was more terrible to them than to their American colleagues. Be that as it may, America is certainly producing much noteworthy work in theology.

One name that has attracted attention is that of Nels F. S. Ferré, a native of Sweden who at the moment is Professor of Philosophical Theology in the School of Religion, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee. We have from his pen an excellent book, *Making Religion Real*.[1] It is not a treatise on theology; it is all about religion and life. It is based on a series of lectures given to several varied audiences, all intelligent but none of them exclusively 'high-brow.' He writes with clarity, using simple language with a wealth of illustration. He writes moreover out of his personal experience—some of it very moving. 'I have written this book,' he says, 'as simply and adequately as I can, in order to share as widely and as effectively as possible what I know to be true—nothing about religion, but a personal experience of reality.'

Religion to Dr. Ferré is inseparably connected with reality. As we all know, there are only too many to whom religion is not real. Such as it is, their religion is vague. It is not real religion if it is separate from their practical activities, their week-day activities. As we do not become fully real persons all at once, we need not expect that our religion will be fully real in a moment. Nay, the larger our life and experience, our religion will be ever becoming more truly real.

Dr. Ferré's book deals with the most important factors which under God contribute to the development. Our religion becomes real through thinking, reading, prayer, worship, the family, friendship, giving, and suffering. We cannot here do more than take one of those topics. Every chapter, in which these matters are successively treated, is noteworthy, and choice among them is arbitrary; but let us take that on thinking, because in a way it is basic. Man's greatness in the animal kingdom is that he alone can think, and real religion cannot exist without thought any more than real life can.

Our first concern must be to *direct* thinking. Two extremes must be avoided, dogmatism and drifting. Dr. Ferré uses the analogy of a man in a boat—'Life is mostly a matter of steering.' Some by nature or training are dogmatic. They have tied down the rudder of their boat. They are cocksure, they cannot seriously consider that in this or that they may be wrong. To fasten the rudder is to court disaster, to be inflexible is to be brittle. 'When the storms of life rage, many dogmatically-minded people break.' Rigidity must not be confused with security nor dogmatism with faith.

The opposite is the mind that drifts. If the dogmatist ties down his rudder, the drifter has let go of it; it slips out of his hand. He is preoccupied with the immediate, his steering is not goal-centred, and his life fails of purpose. The first essential therefore is that our thought should be *directed*.

The second is, our thought should be *focused* on reality. We must have our lives focused for distance, for things unseen and eternal, not the seen and temporal. Only if our minds are focused on the eternal shall we be able to form true judgments on the seen and temporal. Here we are faced with mystery, here we must walk by faith not sight. Those with real religion accept the reality of mystery, finding in faith their security. Though they cannot see behind the veil, they 'find One who has come from the region of mystery with the good news that from it they have nothing to fear,' for God is Love.

Thinking must be directed and focused, finally it must be *dedicated*. The dedicated mind is free, unafraid as Jesus was 'to associate with all people,' unafraid 'to learn from every honest seeker.' Jesus taught that the Priest and Levite, however true to God's external service, missed real religion when they neglected their duty towards the man

[1] Collins; 10s. 6d. net.

despised and in need. 'The mind becomes free when it is loaded with concern, not with abstract claims or high professions or prayers, but with simple passion and open, outgoing care for those about us.' We are living in apocalyptic days; the real decision will be whether we accept or reject God's will for the common good. The mind must be dedicated to truth and love. 'In the local community it becomes practically helpful for every high truth and good cause, and to the ends of the world it pursues that truth and love which can never be overtaken or fully fathomed.'

The Rev. J. B. PHILLIPS to whom so many of us are grateful for his translations of books of the New Testament—and he has done it all except Revelation—has written *New Testament Christianity*.[1] It is a delightful and stimulating book expressing what we shall all be the better for reading, in language that is well-turned, memorable and not seldom deeply moving. It is not an addition to the abundance or superabundance of publications on the history or organization of the primitive Church. There is not a controversial point in it. The author's concern is not to describe the primitive Church, but to unfold primitive Christianity. What were the characteristics of those earliest Christians which enabled them to face persecution and all manner of disappointments and remain conquerors? If their spirit and outlook could be recaptured—and he is sure many people are longing for that—we might confidently expect true spiritual revival. After all, those early Christians were as human as we are, and, as is freely acknowledged, some who professed themselves Christians then turned out to be very weak and unworthy. Yet no one will deny that most of them seem somehow to be on a higher platform than we can show.

Their prime secret was this—they lived very open to the influence of the Holy Spirit. They were not bound, as we all are, by 'traditions' or rigid formularies, or ecclesiastical starch. The Holy Spirit they trusted. We, too, if we would regain their buoyant enthusiasm, must keep ourselves open to the same Spirit.

Then three essentials of their life were Faith, Hope, and Love. Thus in their hearts there reigned Peace. Then to foster and maintain their religion they were closely linked together in a Fellowship of Prayer and Sacrament and mutual encouragement. Lastly they were banded for Service. On all those points Mr. Phillips says wise and challenging things.

[1] Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net.

Let us take, for example, Hope. Many of us feel that while the word 'hope' is often on our lips, it is not quite easy to define. Few are the sermons preached on Hope. Faith, Love, Fellowship, Service—those are frequent pulpit themes, but Hope? The main reason for this may be that we often find it difficult to distinguish clearly between Faith and Hope. Should we speak of the Christian *Faith in*, or the Christian *Hope of* immortality? Is a 'sure and certain hope' not just faith? Into that psychological question Mr. Phillips does not enter. He gives us, however, points which ministers will find good for preaching.

Christian hope is not wishful thinking. In common speech it is often no more, for example, when some one says, 'I do hope that we'll have a fine day for our picnic.' The Communist says with a sneer that Christian Hope is nothing but wishful thinking. We must be on our guard against wishful thinking.

Then, as faith without works is dead, we must guard against being satisfied to 'hope' for good and do nothing which it is within our power to do to help to realize our hope. Many, when they hear of the sufferings of displaced people in refugee camps, say, 'Oh, I do hope their lot will soon be better,' but make no contribution to the funds of the agencies that are trying to better the lot of the displaced. Or they say, 'I do hope that a cure will be discovered for cancer,' but again give not a sixpence to the funds of institutions engaged on Cancer Research.

What, however, is greater matter of concern to the author is the fact that the hopes of too many even among professed Christians are earth-bound, as the hopes of the primitive Christians were not. Now it was perfectly right that the social implications of the gospel should be expounded and emphasised in the pulpit. It is right that we should not be so other-worldly as not to hope and work for such betterment of the environment in which souls live and suffer, as will bring this world a little more like what God meant it to be. Education, control of diseases, slum-clearance and so on are worthy interests for all Christians. The danger is that in avoiding extreme other-worldliness we fall into the other extreme of this-worldliness. Too many pay mere lip-service to the other world, while they really are earth-bound. They get into panic as they think of the possible disasters, such as atomic warfare, which may befall human life on this planet. Which minister has never been grieved, perhaps shocked, by what he has witnessed of the pagan despair and wild bitterness into which

some fall when the earthly hopes of a family have been shattered by some domestic or business calamity ? Mr. PHILLIPS reminds us of St. Paul's words, ' if in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable.' The Christian hope, never indeed quite unconcerned with this life, is mainly centred on the world beyond.

Is it wishful thinking ? No. Our hope is well-grounded in God and God's wise and loving purpose.

Important Hypotheses Reconsidered

VII. The Authorship of the Epistle to the Ephesians

By Principal C. Leslie Mitton, B.A., M.Th., Ph.D., Handsworth College, Birmingham

Many problems we have to be content to leave unsolved. Sometimes, however, one seems to separate itself from the others, and press itself upon our attention, as though insisting that there must be a solution, and that it ought to be found. In some such way the problem of the Authorship of the Epistle to the Ephesians began to thrust itself disconcertingly upon my notice some ten years ago. The arguments which favoured Pauline authorship seemed most tantalisingly balanced with those which were unfavourable. Considerations of style, vocabulary and doctrine appeared to strike an even balance for and against. I found myself searching for some new features which might tilt that even balance to one side or the other. It was the discovery of these which constrained me at length, and not without a measure of reluctance, to reach the conclusion that Pauline authorship could no longer be sustained.

The arguments which to me appeared decisive were derived from a study of the literary relationship of Ephesians to (*a*) its sister Epistle, Colossians ; and (*b*) the other letters in the Pauline Corpus.

(*a*) An analysis of the many very close parallels between Ephesians and Colossians necessitates the conclusion that, if it was Paul who wrote both these Epistles, *he must have written them both at roughly the same time.* It would have been impossible for him to reproduce so much of Colossians in Ephesians, if any considerable period of time had elapsed between the writing of them. On the other hand, the difference in Ephesians in the meaning of certain words and phrases taken over from Colossians makes it quite impossible that the same author wrote both Epistles at the same time. Therefore Paul cannot have been the author of both.

(*b*) The relationship of Ephesians to the other Pauline letters is also significant. In Ephesians words and phrases, as used in these other letters, occur in abundance. Many scholars have quoted this indisputable fact in support of Pauline authorship. There are, however, some notable peculiarities about the manner of their occurrence in Ephesians : (i) Even apart from the frequent borrowings from Colossians (more than a third of whose words re-appear in Ephesians), echoes of Paul's other Epistles are very much more frequent in Ephesians than in a normal letter of Paul's. (ii) Sometimes a single passage in another letter is echoed again and again in Ephesians. (iii) The passages most frequently echoed in this way prove to be passages of outstanding importance, and the words and phrases reproduced are often of a striking nature. (iv) Similar phrases from the other letters are brought together and ' conflated ' in Ephesians (much as Matthew sometimes conflates Mark and Q).

These characteristics are entirely missing from the common material which we find between genuine letters of Paul.

All this seems to imply that the author of Ephesians was a writer who had before him, and knew well, the collected letters of Paul. Since it is most unlikely that Paul himself ever had a collection of his own letters to refer to, and still more unlikely that, even if he had, he would have wished to refer to them in order to write a new letter, this evidence tells strongly against Pauline authorship.

An account of these investigations, and the arguments derived from them, was published in a book [1] in 1951. I have been asked to comment on further contributions to the solution of this problem which have appeared since that time.

Outstanding among these contributions is *Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe*, a book written in German by the Swedish scholar, Ernst

[1] *The Epistle to the Ephesians* (Oxford University Press).

Percy. It was published before my book, but I was not able to gain access to it in time to take account of it, apart from a brief last-minute reference in the Introduction.

This is a work of distinguished, scholarly research, and its conclusion is favourable to the Pauline authorship of Ephesians. That favourable conclusion is, however, reached only with a measure of misgiving and a frank acknowledgment of certain features which refuse to be harmonized with it. As the title indicates, the book investigates the authorship of both Colossians and Ephesians, since on the Continent the former as well as the latter has been widely denied to Paul.

Starting with Colossians, Dr. Percy acknowledges that between it and the other Pauline Epistles there are striking differences, which suggest a difference in authorship. On the other hand, he is able to show that side by side with these differences are abundant signs of identity of authorship. Further he argues that the differences can be explained as developments of certain traits already evident, though less prominent, in the other letters. His conclusion is that these differences can be satisfactorily accounted for (1) by the interval of time which separates the writing of Colossians from the other letters, and also (2) by the difference of theme which is being propounded. In view of these considerations he believes that Colossians can be confidently ascribed to Paul.

His treatment of Ephesians proceeds on similar lines, though with rather less confidence. He recognizes the disconcerting differences between Ephesians and Colossians, as also between Ephesians and the other Paulines. He has, however, no difficulty in showing that there is a large degree of similarity as well (though he does not take account of the peculiarities of the Pauline material in Ephesians). His main investigation at this point, however, concerns Ephesians and Colossians. He shows that approximately the same degree of difference seems to separate Ephesians from Colossians as separates Colossians from the other Pauline letters, and he uses similar arguments to account for the differences. What we find in Ephesians, he claims, is a further development of traits already noticeable in Colossians, and the difference in the occasion of writing and in the subject matter is held to be sufficient explanation of the variation.

This section is less convincing than the earlier one, largely because it is not possible to assume such a considerable interval of time between the writing of the two Epistles as would be sufficient to account for the great difference in their use of the same words and phrases. Dr. Percy frankly recognizes that it must be admitted that if Paul wrote both letters, he must have written them at the same time. We feel, however, that he does not press this admission to its logical conclusion. He notes no less than twenty-five passages in Ephesians where some word or phrase from Colossians is repeated in a similar context, and yet with a noticeably different meaning, or an entirely different application. This is a feature very hard to reconcile with Pauline authorship, unless a considerable interval can be allowed to permit time for such changes to take place in the writer's mind. If the two Epistles were written (as Dr. Percy concedes) *at the same time*, these discrepancies are hardly explicable on the basis of identity of authorship.

Dr. Percy fully recognizes this point. Indeed he writes (p. 418): 'There are several passages in Ephesians where definite traits appear to declare more or less bluntly that a writer other than the author of Colossians has here used thoughts and phrases from Colossians.' He mentions six of the twenty-five passages in which this is particularly true:

(i) Eph 5^{22-33} (cf. Col 3^{18-19}).

(ii) Eph 6^{8} (Col 3^{24-25}).

(iii) The phrase *τῷ συνδέσμῳ τῆς εἰρήνης* in Eph 4^{3} (cf. Col 3^{14}).

(iv) The phrase *εὐχαριστοῦντες . . . ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* in Eph 5^{20} (cf. Col 3^{17}). (To me, perhaps more than any other single item, this seemed to speak decisively against Pauline authorship.)

(v) *ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις* in Eph 5^{21} (cf. Col 3^{16-18}).

(vi) Eph 6^{19} (cf. Col 4^{3}).

Dr. Percy's method of 'neutralizing' these twenty-five centres of resistance is disarming, but not convincing. He treats each one as an awkward, disturbing unit; isolates it from the others; shows that by itself it cannot be regarded as decisive; and then largely disregards its existence. It is the method elsewhere described as that of 'Divide and Conquer.' It is easy to forget that besides the one dissident fact under consideration, there are all the time twenty-four others, equally dissident, and five or six of them remorselessly so. Would a genuinely Pauline letter include so many 'irreducible surds'?

Dr. Percy notes these difficulties, but in the end passes them by as not being insuperable obstacles to Pauline authorship. What, then, are the deciding factors that lead him to retain a belief in Pauline authorship? They are three: Firstly, the fact that there is so much in the letter which is fundamentally Pauline. Secondly, there is the precise claim in 3^{1} that Paul is the author.

Thirdly, he cannot find, either in the suggestions of others or in the reconstructions of his own mind, any really probable situation in which a disciple of Paul should want to produce, *in the name of Paul*, just such a document as this.

To the first we might reply that it was the very aim of the writer to reproduce the essential message of Paul in Paul's own words and manner.

The second objection perhaps reveals an unwarranted application of modern standards of literary decorum to a period when those standards were not applicable. Dr. Percy writes, for instance, on p. 443 : ' I hesitate to see in Ephesians a pseudonymous writing. . . . This is due before anything else to this fact, that it seems hardly possible to understand Ephesians, as a whole, as a post-Pauline " Fiktion." ' ' *Fiktion* ' and ' forgery ' are inadmissible words in this connection, since they are hardly unprejudiced words, but words which imply condemnation. Perhaps Dr. Percy is unduly reluctant to admit the ancient conventions with regard to pseudonymity. The use of Paul's name is to us disconcerting, if the Epistle was not precisely written by Paul. But there is good reason to believe that ancient conventions in this regard were curiously different from our own. Pseudonymous writings occur in both the Old and New Testament, as well as in non-canonical literature. Tertullian recognizes the legitimacy of pseudonymity when he writes : ' It is allowable that that which pupils publish should be regarded as their master's work ' (*Adv. Marcion*, iv. 5). It might even have been thought an impertinence for a pupil to seek to summarize his master's message, and allow his own name, instead of his master's, to appear in it. Goguel writes : ' In the case of the books of the New Testament, pseudonymity is not a fraudulent trick, whose purpose is to introduce novel ideas by ascribing to them some distinguished name. It declares the belief of the authors that they are not producing some work of their own, but merely expressing the doctrine, or rather the message, of the Church.'

Dr. Percy's third objection is the absence of any acceptable set of circumstances in which Ephesians could have been produced as a post-Pauline pseudonymous writing. E. J. Goodspeed believes that his theory meets this very difficulty. He suggests that those Pauline letters, which were not entirely lost, were for a whole generation ignored, if not actually forgotten, until a disciple of Paul (about the year A.D. 90) searched them out and collected them. This disciple then wrote Ephesians to serve as an introduction to this first Pauline Corpus, incorporating into it as much as he could of the teaching and the very materials of the genuine Epistles. As such it was addressed to the whole Church, and not to any one local community.

Dr. Percy does not find himself able to accept this theory, and makes three main criticisms of it : (i) Ephesians cannot have been addressed to the Church as a whole, because the readers addressed in it are differentiated from other Christians (Eph $1^{13.15}$ $2^{21f.}$ 3^{18} 6^{18}). (ii) An Introduction would have to stand first, and if Ephesians had held this position, some reference to it in the letter would be expected. (iii) Not all the contents of the letter are suited to this suggested purpose (though Jülicher and others, as well as Goodspeed, recognized that parts of the letter are). The moral instructions to certain precise groups of people seem inappropriate in such circumstances.

These criticisms can, in part, be countered by slight modifications of Goodspeed's theory. Perhaps Ephesians was first written, not for the Church as a whole, but for the churches in the neighbourhood of Ephesus, where the Pauline Corpus was first published. The collector may not have visualized a universal welcome for the Corpus, but intended it in the first place for the near-by churches where Paul had worked. Indeed it is possible that Ephesians was not intended so much as an introduction, as a kind of generalized summary of their contents, to serve as a substitute for the letters themselves, addressed as they were to remote places and unfamiliar situations.

This lack of a suitable context for the late production of Ephesians appears to be the decisive factor in Dr. Percy's refusal to abandon Pauline authorship.

His book is not yet available in English, and this is a pity, for it is the outstanding defence of the Pauline Authorship of Ephesians. No other examination of the problem faces so frankly the real difficulties of this position, and attempts to meet those difficulties with such conscientious thoroughness. Many have found themselves reassured about Pauline authorship through reading it, but, for the reasons given, it falls short of being conclusive.

Another recent contribution to this subject has come from Charles Masson, Professor at Lausanne University, in his two commentaries, one on Colossians [1950] and the other on Ephesians [1953]. These are volumes 10 and 9 in a new series of French commentaries, published by Delachaux and Niestlé. It was while writing the first of these that Professor Masson found himself driven, by the very features of the Epistle which he had to account for, into adopting (to his own surprise) a theory of the relationship of these two

Epistles, which is roughly similar to that favoured by H. J. Holtzmann in 1872.

Holtzmann then argued that, embedded in our present Colossians, is a brief letter of Paul's addressed to that church. This original letter was later used as the basis for a greatly expanded version, which became known as the Epistle to the Ephesians. This same post-Pauline writer then returned to the original brief letter, and enlarged it by interpolating into its text materials similar to those already included in Ephesians. This second work of his is that known to us as Colossians.

This theory never won any considerable acceptance, though so discerning a scholar as Johannes Weiss gave it his approval. It is a very complicated hypothesis, envisaging a very complicated process of writing and editing, but the literary features it tries to explain may need to be re-examined. Professor John Knox has written that this theory has 'probably been too quickly dismissed.' Professor Masson has, therefore, done us a service in forcing the matter upon our attention. It is, however, unfortunate that he raises the matter as a kind of side-issue in the course of two brief commentaries. It would have been better if such a departure from current orthodoxy had been argued in a separate book, rather than as a recurring parenthesis in a work of exegesis.

Perhaps it is in place here to give just one instance of the phenomena which this theory seeks to explain. Professor Masson points out that in the passage, Col 1^{3-7}, *vv.* 3–4 consist of simple straightforward phrases of introduction, immediately recognisable as Pauline. *Vv.* 5–6 are, however, quite different. They are complicated and un-Pauline. 'Hope' appears almost to be dragged in to complete the Pauline trilogy with 'faith' and 'love' already mentioned in *v.* 4. But the word 'hope' is not used in its Pauline sense of a present, eager looking forward, but is equated with 'the object of our hope,' and it is 'laid up in heaven.' *Vv.* 5–6 have, moreover, parallels in Eph 1^{18} and 1^{13}, and are best understood as borrowings from Ephesians which have been superimposed upon an original Pauline letter. Many similar instances are brought to the reader's notice, and some explanation is needed, though the correct one may not be that which Professor Masson offers. His theory, of course, assumes not only that Ephesians is non-Pauline, but also that Colossians, in its present form, is Pauline only in part.

F. C. Synge in *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians* [1941] has argued that Ephesians is to be regarded as a genuinely Pauline letter, but that Colossians is a later non-Pauline production based upon it. This is a solution of the problem of their relationship which has received very little support, though others are investigating it further, and we may hear more of it.

In reviews of my book, two points are mentioned which should perhaps receive mention here. In defence of Pauline authorship, it was suggested that its fundamental similarity to Paul's writings, side by side with its curious differences, might be accounted for by the assumption that Paul dictated Philemon and Colossians to an amanuensis (perhaps Timothy), and then outlined to him the substance of Ephesians, and allowed him to put it into its final shape in his own way to serve as a circular letter. This suggestion (not a new one, of course), might explain the curious relationship between Colossians and Ephesians, but would utterly fail to account for the peculiarity of the relationship of Ephesians to the other Pauline letters. Timothy, even less than Paul himself, could not have echoed so much from these letters, unless he had had the collected letters before him, which is hardly credible.

E. Käsemann, who has himself made important contributions to the study of Ephesians, writing in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, accepts its non-Pauline authorship without question. Indeed he is perplexed that on this side of the Channel the position still needs to be argued. He wishes my book had concerned itself less with arguments about authorship, and more with the influences which produced Ephesians. He is not impressed with suggestions that concern themselves with literary relationships with the Pauline Corpus. He discards all theories of documentary origins, in favour of the influences of 'liturgical usage,' 'paranetic schemes and forms,' and current modes of 'church instruction.'

Once the non-Pauline authorship is conceded (which in this country cannot be taken for granted), then the influence of contemporary church usages certainly needs to be investigated. But if an explanation of Ephesians can be found within the known literary documents of the New Testament, especially in Colossians and the other Pauline letters, it is hardly wise to turn from the known to some hypothetical liturgical usages. It is only when the known fails to offer an explanation that the unknown needs to be explored. 'Traditional forms' and 'current church instruction' *may* lie behind Ephesians and may have contributed to its construction, but the written documents of the Pauline Corpus almost certainly played a bigger part.

It may even now be possible for individuals to feel that the problem of Ephesians has been, for them, solved in one direction or another, but it must be admitted that the problem as a whole still remains open to discussion.

Joseph the Patriarch in Patristic Teaching

By the Reverend A. W. Argyle, M.A., B.D., Oxford

One of the surprises of the Old Testament is the absence of any allusions in the prophets to the story of Joseph. There are references to 'the house of Joseph,' 'the remnant of Joseph,' 'the affliction of Joseph,' but in every case it is to the tribe, not to the story of Joseph the patriarch in Gn 37 f. that reference is made. Yet scholars tell us that this wonderful story was written down before the prophetical books. The high ethical principles which it inculcates are those which the prophets proclaimed. One would have expected them to appeal to the example of Joseph, the righteous man, afflicted and sold by his brethren, steadfast in resisting temptation, unjustly accused, arrested, imprisoned, humiliated, but afterwards exalted, the benefactor of others, tender-hearted, forgiving his brethren who had wronged him. His loving-kindness and mercy, his faithfulness and truthfulness, his righteousness and justice, were the very qualities for which the great ethical prophets stood. Their neglect of what is undoubtedly one of the greatest stories in all literature is all the more unaccountable. This neglect is partially remedied in Ps $105^{17f.}$, Wis $10^{13f.}$, Sir 49^{15}, 1 Mac 2^{53}, Jub 39–43, 1 En $89^{13f.}$. But it is in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, written by a member of the Pharisaic party in Hebrew about the end of the second century B.C., that the story of Joseph first comes into its own as the fertile source of moral instruction and exhortation. These Testaments, in their Greek translation, considerably influenced the language and ethical teaching of the New Testament.[1] The delightful romance called *The Book of the Prayer of Asenath* is also a notable tribute to the character of Joseph.

In the Christian Church from very early times the story of Joseph achieved great prominence. The Christian Fathers make use of it in two ways: (1) as prefiguring the Incarnation, Passion, and Exaltation of our Lord; (2) as providing a pattern for Christian character and conduct.

[1] See *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, tr. and ed. by R. H. Charles, pp. lxxviii.–xcii. M. de Jonge, on the other hand, in his recent book on the Testaments argues that they are not a Jewish work of the second century B.C. with Christian additions, but a Christian work of the second century A.D., based on Jewish haggadic material. It remains to be seen, however, whether scholars will be convinced by his arguments.

I

That Joseph, the son of Jacob, prefigured Jesus, the Son of God, was a tradition already firmly established and clearly attested in Christian writings of the second century. Justin Martyr (*Dial. c. Trypho.*, 36), followed by Tertullian (*Adv. Marcionem*, iii. 18; *Adv. Judaeos*, 10), interprets the horns of the unicorn (Dt 33^{17}) in the section of the Blessing of Moses which related to Joseph, as signifying the Cross of Jesus. Before such a remote interpretation could be evolved, speculation upon the resemblances between Joseph and Jesus must have been proceeding for a considerable time. Attention would naturally have been directed in the first place to the parallels between the experiences of Joseph and those of Jesus. It is to these also that Tertullian goes on to refer in a passage cited above (*Adv. Marcionem*, iii. 18), where he says that Joseph prefigured Christ because he suffered persecution at the hands of his brethren, and was sold into Egypt on account of the grace of God (*ob gratiam Dei*) just as Christ also was sold by Jews, His brethren according to the flesh (*a Judaeis carnaliter fratribus*), when He was delivered up by Judas. Irenaeus affirms simply that Christ προετυπώθη in Joseph (*Frag.* 7 [Migne, *P. G.*, viii. col. 1240]).

Origen (died A.D. 254) carries the analogy further, declaring that Jacob saw in Joseph 'the true life, which is the true God, Christ' (*in Genesim*, Hom., xv.; Gn 45^{25-26}); and describing Jesus as 'the true Joseph, our Lord and Saviour' (*ib.*; Gn 46^{4}). Cyprian finds Christ prefigured in the patient endurance of suffering exhibited by Abel, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, and Moses (*Liber de bono patientiae* [Migne, *P. L.*, iv. col. 652–3]). Jerome declares emphatically: '*Joseph . . . in typo praecessit Domini salvatoris*' (*Ep. ad Riparium presbyterum*, n. 2 [*P. L.*, xxii. col. 908]).

The character of Joseph as a type of Jesus is particularly prominent in the sermons of Chrysostom. In Joseph's visit to his brethren and their harsh treatment of him, Chrysostom sees the prefiguring of Christ's visit to mankind and His sufferings at the hands of the Jews. 'Just as Joseph went away to his brethren to see to their needs (ἐπισκεψόμενος αὐτούς), and they, reverencing neither brotherhood nor the reason for his coming, at first plotted to kill him, but afterwards

sold him to the barbarians, so also our Lord . . . came to see to the needs of the human race (*ἐπισκεψόμενος τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος*) and took upon Himself humanity like ours, and, deeming it right to become our brother, thus arrived. . . . But the hard-hearted Jews tried to slay the physician of bodies and souls who was working countless wonders (*μυρία θαύματα*) every day. . . . And they crucified Him who had accepted the form of a servant for our salvation. But whereas the Jews not only tried to kill Him, but actually did deliver Him up to the Cross and slay Him, the brothers of Joseph plotted to kill him, but did not carry their plots to the deed. The type had to fall short of the reality, of which it was the type' (*ἔδει δὲ τὸν τύπον ἔλαττον ἔχειν τῆς ἀληθείας*). (*In Gen.* 37, Hom. lxi. [*P. G.*, liv. col. 528].) Chrysostom, moreover, asserts that Joseph's silence before his accusers was the prototype of Christ's silence before His enemies. 'What then did Joseph? He held his peace, and thus is condemned, even as Christ is also. For all those things are types of these' (Hom., lxxxiv., Mt 26^{51-54}).

By no patristic writer are the adventures of Joseph more extensively treated as a type of the work of Christ than by Ambrose. He has a whole book on Joseph, in which he declares that the patriarch's sufferings at the hands of his brethren are '*de populo et de Domino Jesu mysterium*' (*De Joseph Patriarcha*, 14 [*P. L.*, xiv. col. 646]). Of the marriage of Joseph with Asenath he writes: '*Quis autem est qui ex gentibus accepit uxorem, nisi qui Ecclesiam ex nationibus sibi congregavit*' (*ib.*, 40). Asenath, the bride of Joseph, typifies the Christian Church, the bride of Christ. (Cf. Eph 5^{23}, Ro 7^{4}, Mk 2^{19-20}. Cf. also the dictum of 2 Clem 14: *τὸ ἄρσεν ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός, τὸ θῆλυ ἡ ἐκκλησία.*) Point by point Ambrose makes the story of Joseph prefigure that of Jesus. It was Judah who sold Joseph, Judas who sold Jesus. When Joseph reveals himself to his brethren (Gn 45^{5}) he says, 'Be not grieved.' So Jesus, when He revealed Himself after His resurrection, said: 'Fear not' (Mt 28^{10}); 'Peace be unto you' (Lk 24^{36}), and 'Why are ye troubled?' (Lk 24^{38}).

Augustine also frequently alludes to the resemblances between Joseph and Jesus. 'Our Joseph (*Joseph noster, i.e.* Jesus), having been exalted from the lowest position, is adored by the Church in this world, as it were in Egypt (*velut in Aegypto*)' (*Ep. Cl.*, iii. c. 39 [*P. L.*, xxxiii. col. 919]). 'For just as Joseph was delivered up to the Egyptians by his brethren, so Christ was killed by the Jews and delivered up to the Gentiles, for this purpose, that the remnant of Israel also might be saved' (*Quaest. in Heptat.*, cxlviii. [*P. L.*, xxxiv. col. 588]).

Cyril of Alexandria, in his turn, devotes careful attention to Joseph. He finds Jacob's blessing of Joseph (Gn 49^{22-26}) to be 'a word of prophecy relating to our Emmanuel.' For instance, *vv.* 25 and 26 are said to set forth 'the generation of the only-begotten from the God and Father, and also the generation through the holy Virgin' (*P. G.*, lxix. col. 376).

Passing over the centuries, we discover that the Venerable Bede stands in the same tradition. 'Joseph signifies Christ the Lord.' 'The coat of many colours, which his father made for him, signifies the variety of peoples from all the nations gathered into the body of Christ.' 'Jacob sent Joseph, his son, that he might exercise care for his brethren. And God the Father sent His only-begotten Son, that He might visit the human race, which was weary with sins' (*ut genus humanum peccatis lanquidum visitaret*). As Judah sold Joseph, so Judas sold Jesus. And so throughout the story of Joseph his prefiguring of Jesus is traced to the last detail. '*Joseph . . . typum Christi gerebat*' (*In Pentateuchum Commentarii*, Gn 37–38 [*P. L.*, xci. col. 265–6]).

Enough has been said to show how widely and persistently the tradition of treating Joseph as a type of Christ prevailed.

II

No less strong was the tradition of regarding Joseph as a pattern of conduct for Christian disciples. Athanasius says that his enemies are convicted by their conscience just as those who plotted against Joseph were convicted by theirs (*Apologia ad Constantium Imp.*, 12 [*P. G.*, xxv. col. 609]). The chastity of Joseph is commended by Gregory of Nyssa (*Contra Fornicarios* [*P. G.*, xlvi. col. 493 f.]) and by St. Basil in *Sermo* xix. (*De Temperantia et Incontinentia* [*P. G.*, xxxii. col. 1348]) and in *Epistles*, ii. and xlvi. (*Epistolarum Classis*, i.). Cyprian compares the sufferings of Christians with those of Abel and of Joseph (*Ad Fortunatum de Martyrio* [*P. L.*, iv. col. 693]). Similarly the envy and malice of Cain and the brothers of Joseph are types of the enmity being directed against the Christians (*Liber de zelo et livore* [*P. L.*, iv. col. 666]).

Chrysostom commends Joseph as an example of Christian forgiveness, love for enemies, and the readiness to return good for evil and overcome evil with good. Joseph, he says, fulfilled Christ's commandment: 'Love your enemies, pray for those who despitefully use you' (*Hom.*, lxiv., Gen 41^{46-49}, n. 7). As in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, so in the Fathers Joseph is set forth as the exemplar of purity, righteousness, and that generous spirit of love, good-will, and forgiveness, which good men must oppose to the envy and malice of their foes.

Bede, commenting on Mk 14^{51-52}, identifies the young man who fled naked as John the beloved disciple! But the passage also reminds him, as it has reminded others, of 'the example of the blessed Joseph, who, leaving his garment in the hands of the adulteress, leaped out of doors, preferring to serve God naked rather than, being clad with the lusts of the world, to serve a harlot' (*exemplum beati Joseph, qui, relicto in manibus adulterae pallio, foras exsilivit, malens Deo nudus quam indutus cupiditatibus mundi meretrici servire*) (*In Marci Evangelium Expositio*, Lib. iv. [*P. L.*, xcii. col. 279]). Once again Joseph is commended as the pattern of Christian chastity. It is not surprising that Bede and others should have seen a striking parallel between the encounter of the young follower of Jesus with the Lord's enemies and false accusers and that of Joseph with Potiphar's wife. We have only to set the account in Mark side by side with those in Gn 39^{12} (LXX) and the Testament of Joseph (8^{3}) to see the remarkable similarity of language.

Mark 14^{52}	Gen 39^{12}	T. Jos 8^{3}
. κρατοῦσιν αὐτόν.	καὶ καταλείπων τὰ ἱμάτια	κρατεῖ μου τὸν χιτῶνα,
ὁ δὲ καταλιπὼν	αὐτοῦ	καταλείψας αὐτὸν
τὴν σινδόνα γυμνὸς ἔφυγεν.	ἔφυγεν. καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἔξω	ἔφυγον γυμνός.

The passage in the Testament of Joseph happens to precede immediately another passage which concerns the imprisonment of Joseph and which appears to be echoed in the description of the imprisonment of Paul and Silas (Ac 16^{25}). In T. Joseph 8^{5} Joseph says: 'When I was in prison the Egyptian woman was oppressed with grief, and she came and overheard (ἐπηκροᾶτο) how I gave thanks and sang praises (ὕμνουν) in the house of darkness.' In Acts we read: 'At midnight Paul and Silas prayed and sang praises (ὕμνουν) to God, and the prisoners overheard (ἐπηκροῶντο) them.' The verbal parallels are striking.[1] The resemblances of these two consecutive passages in the Testament of Joseph to Mk 14^{52}, Ac 16^{25}, suggest that perhaps the thought of Christians fulfilling the rôle of Joseph was not absent from the minds of New Testament writers.

III

This consideration leads us to ask how far the Patristic notion of Joseph's prefiguring Christ Himself had any place in New Testament thought. That the New Testament writers were not blind to the obvious resemblances between the story of Joseph and the story of Jesus we may well believe. Professor Ethelbert Stauffer, in his book *Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments* [1941], 322–325, has an appendix (*Beilage*, iv.) entitled *Josephtradition und Petrusformeln*, in which he seeks to show that the form of the contrast between the sufferings of Joseph at the hands of men and his vindication by God in the various Joseph literature [2] is echoed in the form of the contrast drawn between the Passion and Exaltation of Jesus in the Petrine speeches in Acts. The evidence which he adduces is not entirely convincing.

More striking is the parallel between Joseph and Jesus suggested by echoes of the Testament of Zebulun in Mt 27^{4-6}. In T. Zeb. 2^{2} the phrase αἷμα ἀθῷον ('innocent blood') is used of the blood of Joseph. In Mt 27^{4} Judas Iscariot uses the same phrase of the blood of Jesus. In T. Zeb. 3^{3} the phrase τιμὴ αἵματος ('the price of blood') is used of the price at which Joseph was sold. In Mt 27^{6} the same phrase is used of the price at which Jesus was sold.[3]

But, whether or not the Patristic doctrine that Joseph prefigured Jesus has any place in New Testament thought or in any way moulded its language, it cannot be said that all the resemblances adduced by the Fathers between the story of Joseph and that of our Lord are due to forced or fanciful exegesis. We may smile at their notion that the Joseph narrative is an actual allegory and prophecy of the gospel events, and we may well be thankful that the nightmare of such fanciful allegorizing has passed away. Nevertheless the Patristic preaching which could proclaim the gospel from an Old Testament narrative is not to be despised.

Has the story of Joseph any place in modern preaching of the gospel? Or is it left to the Sunday School lessons? Even there, is its evangelical import brought out? Certainly the message of this great story, told with unsurpassed beauty and restraint in the Bible, is not without relevance to an age of decaying morals like our own.

[1] Cf. *Beginnings of Christianity*, ii. 78.

[2] Gn 45–50, Wis 10^{13}, Sir 49^{15}, 1 Mac 2^{53}, Jub 39–43, 1 En $89^{13ff.}$, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *The Book of the Prayer of Asenath*, Philo, *De Jos.*, 99, Josephus, *Ant.*, ii. 20.

[3] Cf. also Lk 2^{51} ('his mother kept all these sayings in her heart') with Gn 37^{11} ('his father kept the saying in mind').

Literature

BAPTISM

It is not often that so profoundly theological a document is received by a supreme Church Court and passed to lower Courts for consideration as is the case with the *Interim Report of the Church of Scotland Special Commission on Baptism* (Church of Scotland Publications Department; 2s. net). The Report presents an 'outline study of the doctrine of Baptism in the New Testament,' and the Commission has been 'hard at work for two years' in its preparation. First of all, it is noted that 'a most important and exciting reorientation has been taking place' in Biblical studies: the analytic approach, so fruitfully made by criticism, is now being supplemented by a synthetic approach, in which a more positive theological exegesis makes it possible to 'let the Scriptures speak to us in terms of themselves.' There has been a deeper 'penetration into the Biblical mind as shaped by divine revelation' and the underlying unity of the New Testament and of the New Testament with the Old Testament has been made clearer. It may be said that the new approach has a direct counterpart in the treatment here given to the important doctrine of Baptism. The chief general merit of this document is that it resolutely sets Baptism in its proper context. It would misrepresent the case to say that it was made part of a system. The use of the term 'mystery,' which is tentatively suggested as a possible alternative to sacrament, contradicts the idea of a system, rounded off and complete. But Baptism is represented as finding its proper place and therefore its meaning within the organism of Christian truth and as part of a view which must be synoptic if it is to be correct. If such a weighty and many-sided study may be said to have one, this is the key to the document.

Two preliminary questions in the minds of all concerned with a right understanding of Baptism receive clear answers. The first is briefly discussed—whether the rite can claim to be dominical, and, in the absence of either textual or dogmatic grounds for doubting it, an affirmative answer is given. The second question concerns the grounds for the practice of Infant Baptism. The fresh and vigorous treatment of this question, so earnestly discussed to-day, calls for careful study, especially by Baptists. (When 'believers' Baptism' is said to be incompatible with the Biblical teaching about the nature of man, this must surely mean Baptism understood to apply exclusively to believers; for of course churches which normally practise Infant Baptism have always permitted Baptism to adults on profession of faith.)

Baptism is shown in its relation to the Old Testament, and, through proselyte Baptism and the Baptism of John the Baptist, to that of our Lord Himself. On the other side, it is related prospectively to the eschatological consummation. But perhaps the most valuable part of the whole discussion is the interpretation of Ro 6, and the steady affirmation that St. Paul means that Baptism is not merely a symbol of the historical fact of Christ's death and resurrection, but the very means whereby men are identified with that death and resurrection. Baptism is the point at which 'we are inserted into the event of the Cross' so that the efficacy of Baptism is the efficacy of the death and resurrection of Christ Himself. Here is an objectivity which already presages what must later be said about the Reformers' restoration of faith to its proper place of importance. Since we are 'baptised out of ourselves,' faith must be regarded not as a condition but rather as a response.

Helped by a most useful Study Outline, those who study and learn from this document will be done for ever with fragmentary views of Baptism (as though it were merely an initiatory rite), and with meagre appreciation of it (as though, like inoculation, children should just 'have it done'). And they will wait eagerly the examination which is to be undertaken of the Reformers' doctrine.

J. K. S. Reid

P. T. FORSYTH

The Independent Press continues the good work of re-issuing the major works of P. T. Forsyth. The latest reprint is *Faith, Freedom and the Future* (12s. 6d. net). It is still a book for the times, for Forsyth had the power to pierce through to the central and abiding issues. While it is a book that sets out to analyse the Independent or Congregational tradition 'the writer's eye is always on the Church Universal, the world of men, and the Saviour of the race.' Long before the ecumenical movement had taken definite shape Forsyth had learnt what it is to speak ecumenically from within a particular denomination.

On almost every page we meet the Forsythian 'flash.' (It is very hard to understand how his theology could ever have been described as 'fireworks in a fog!') Here are a few instances. 'Emancipation took the place of redemption, and

revolution of regeneration.' 'The freaks ascribed to the Spirit arrest far more attention than the frost which settles on the Word.' 'The source of Independency was Calvinism, its genius was Anabaptism, its soil was the English character.' Of mysticism separated from the Word, he writes: 'It sails by no star, and it boxes the compass of the creeds, till it is captured drifting, and towed into port by a cruiser of Rome.' Of the bearing of religion on politics he says: 'The more the Church refuses to go down into the party clash, so much the more explicit she should be in her moral guidance to those who do.' Some of his sentences might have been written for the year 1956—as when he tells us that we must see Christ as the Lord and Judge of Labour, as He is of Capital: or when he sharply reminds dogmatic orthodoxy that it runs the risk of becoming 'a new Egypt for the new Israel.' And, as always in his writing, the hardest blows have a setting of positive and constructive theology.

It is Forsyth's claim that the best in the Independent witness in history has been its fusion of Calvinistic with Anabaptist elements. It has aimed, in fact, at a religion of the Word and of the Spirit and has been unhappy both with dogma divorced from personal experience and subjective religion that runs to extreme enthusiasm and irresponsible freedom. Its supreme danger is that it may fasten on spiritual liberty as its basic principle. Forsyth is never weary of reminding his fellow-Churchmen that freedom is always 'founded freedom,' freedom founded on the gospel of grace.

While this book speaks sharply still to Forsyth's successors in his own communion, it has much to say to the whole Church. While Forsyth spoke against a shallow theological liberalism in favour of a vital orthodoxy, he saw clearly that orthodoxy is always in peril of imprisoning the creative gospel within its own patterns of creed, convention and liturgy. His own standpoint with its powerful sense of the Great Church (a phrase he often used), the redeeming Word and the life-giving Spirit was true to the three elements in the Church ecumenical which Bishop Newbiggin has described in his book 'The Household of God.' This generation will continue to find inspiration in his teaching.

CHARLES S. DUTHIE

JOURNAL OF SEMITIC STUDIES

It is a pleasure to welcome the first issue of a new learned quarterly, the *Journal of Semitic Studies*, which is edited by H. H. Rowley and P. R. Weis, published by the Manchester University Press, and supported by the Isaac Wolfson Foundation. Each issue will be ninety-six pages in length, and will cost 10s. 6d., a most modest price. The *Journal* will contain linguistic, literary, historical, archaeological, and cultural studies dealing with the whole field of Semitic scholarship. Jewish studies will receive special attention, and reviews and short notices of books will be included in each issue. Articles will normally be in English, but contributions may be submitted also in French or German. Monographs associated with the *Journal*, under the title *Studia Semitica*, will, it is hoped, be published from time to time.

In the present issue there are three articles which will be of special interest to Old Testament scholars—those by L. Koehler, who writes on problems in the study of the language of the Old Testament; by O. Eissfeldt, who discusses the relationship between El and Yahweh; and by D. Daube and R. Yaron, who consider, from the point of view of legal phraseology, Jacob's reception by Laban (Gn 29^{14}). Among the books reviewed are a dozen or so which deal with the Old Testament and related subjects. The *Journal* gives every appearance of having gone off to an excellent start. Semitic scholars everywhere will wish it well.

D. WINTON THOMAS

THE MIRACLES OF JESUS

The Church of Scotland Youth Committee's Handbook on the miracles, *And He Had Compassion On Them* (6s. net), by the Rev. William Barclay, B.D., Lecturer on the New Testament in Glasgow University, lets any reader understand how this scholar is exercising so wide and powerful an influence on the youth of the churches in Scotland to-day. His vivacious outpouring of information and practical suggestion is never concerned to display yet cannot conceal the theological learning and searching insight that underlies all that is presented in so popular a form.

His comment on the man born blind is an example of his trenchant exposition—'He could not say who Jesus was but he could say, and was determined to say, what Jesus had done for him. He might not know much about Christian theology but he knew a very great deal about Christian experience. He might have no ideas about the Person of Christ but he had very definite ideas about the power of Christ.'

And here is his surprising yet attractive interpretation of the miracle of the raising of Lazarus. 'There is something behind this story but the story is not meant to be taken literally. . . . Is it possible that Lazarus had committed some terrible sin which shattered the home in Bethany, that he had done something which made his name stink like the stench of a corpse, that he was dead

to shame, dead to honour, dead to repentance, that the hearts of his sisters were broken, and that Jesus came and raised this Lazarus from sin. . . . Is it possible that here we have the greatest conversion story in the New Testament ? '

There are, of course, places where questions might be pressed. The definition of miracle as ' something defying human skill to perform or human wisdom to explain ' should perhaps be expanded to add that the word ' miracle ' also means positively that thinking does not stop at this confession but goes on to the assertion that the thing is the work of a personal God.

In this sense the three typical miracles are surely creation, resurrection, and the every-day miracle of spiritual life going on in an intimate, unfathomable connexion with the bodily frame. The real question is whether to-day or in New Testament times events happened which have to be put in the same category as these three typical miracles. Their characteristic is that in approaching them scientific inquiry can find no foothold whatever.

In these neo-dogmatic days it is refreshing to be in contact with the mind of a scholar who is interested in history and facts and moral issues and feels these matters proper nourishment for faith. Every page is packed with material gathered from an amazing range of sources ancient and modern. And who can be sure that a more condensed or studied style would leave the book as effectively useful ?

R. W. Stewart

THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE REFORMED CHURCHES

The Old Testament Since the Reformation, by Professor Emil G. Kraeling (Lutterworth Press ; 27s. 6d. net), is a history of theological attitudes to the Old Testament in the Reformed Churches from Luther to the present day. The author takes the development of criticism and technique as a background to the problems of theologians and pastors. His book describes the points of view put forward by those who have seen the New Testament as a constant, the Old Testament as a variable, in their religious beliefs. The latter, according to his picture, resembles an uncouth, vigorous old relative, whom it would be impious to turn out of doors. Should he be kept in the background or should he take his place in the family and be on view to visitors ? Luther wanted to confine him in order to allow greater freedom to other members of the family. Later reformers brought him out again to frighten off the Anabaptists ; but Calvin's solution of making him head of the household proved uncomfortable. The higher criticism turned its pitiless rays on him without dissolving his irrefutable claims to kinship. Professor Kraeling lists the compromises of varying shades of subtlety and ingenuity which have been tried one after the other. He himself holds the indulgent view of the emancipated : ' For there are times when we prefer to read ancient books with an eye to appreciating and enjoying them, instead of getting wrought up over " decisions," " time and eternity " and other deadly serious matters.' While favouring a liberal Lutheran position, he contents himself with stating the problem, which he finds insoluble. Each generation and each individual must think it out anew. The strain of doing so is fruitful.

It follows from the subject-matter that the author will concentrate on Germany, though he mentions some developments in the United States and in our ' tight little isle.' France is barely glanced at. ' In France, Bayle proclaimed the rule of reason ' is rather misleading, seeing that Bayle published in Holland. Consequently the book will have value mainly as a guide to the thought of Protestant Germany. The bibliography makes a good starting point for any further work on this. The non-German-reading student will be able to use it as a kind of encyclopaedia. Its defect lies precisely in its resemblance to an encyclopaedia : it turns into a mere catalogue of theories. The unsystematic treatment involves much repetition, since the same theses were often restated in differing terms. The presentation is sometimes inconsistent. Lessing's ' Anti-Goeze ' (1778) ' for ever robbed of intellectual respectability a biblicism operating with the idea of an infallible, authoritative book.' Yet still, a hundred years later, Wellhausen ' made for ever impossible the belief on the part of the intelligent portion of humanity that the Old Testament writings were a supernatural communication of the Holy Spirit.' It would have been more helpful, though much more difficult, to explain and compare the main lines of approach, and to show their connection with historical situations. The actual chronological sequence of writers could have been set out in a chart.

Beryl Smalley

THE PAULINE LETTERS

The Formation of the Pauline Corpus of Letters, by Principal C. Leslie Mitton (Epworth Press ; 8s. 6d.), expounds at length a theory which in America is largely connected with the names of E. J. Goodspeed and J. Knox. For many generations, in so far as people thought about it at all, the idea was that Paul's letters were always reverenced, and that bit by bit, by a process of natural growth, they grew into Scripture. Goodspeed and Knox believe that that was very far from being

the case. They believe that for years Paul's letters were neglected and forgotten, that in fact Paul's name was neglected and forgotten. This continued until about A.D. 90. About that time a personal and intimate disciple of Paul, who knew of one or two surviving letters of Paul, was moved to search and inquire for any others which might exist. His search was highly successful; and the product of his search was published in Ephesus about A.D.90. So, then, so far from being regarded with increasing reverence Paul's letters very nearly fell into complete oblivion, and were only rescued by a deliberate act of research and of publication towards the end of the first century. It is adduced as proof of that that the other New Testament books which were published before A.D. 90 are quite ignorant of Paul's letters, while those which were published after A.D. 90 know them well. It may be noted that this argument involves placing First Peter later than A.D. 90, which, of course, means that Peter could not have written it—an assumption with which by no means all will agree.

This theory goes one step further. The collection may well have been made by Onesimus. And still further, when the collection was made, the letter which is now known as the Epistle to the Ephesians was composed as a general introduction by the collector and editor. We are well aware of all the linguistic and quotational arguments which can be adduced to indicate that such was the genesis of Ephesians. Dr. Mitton himself has previously worked them out with a wealth of scholarship. But the reviewer believes that the theory is untenable. Long ago E. F. Scott stated the basic objection. Ephesians does not read like a secondary work; Ephesians has indeed been called 'The Queen of the Epistles.' Therefore, if Paul did not write it, we have to postulate a quite unknown teacher who was at least as great as Paul. Can we really assume that somewhere in the Church there was this unknown, who had as great a mind as Paul had, and a mind very like the mind that Paul had? Surely it is far more sensible to believe that none other than Paul himself did actually write Ephesians.

Every one who reads this book will enjoy it, for it is written with the mastery and the lucidity of the expert. Every one who reads this book will admire it, for here is scholarship wide and meticulously accurate. But the reviewer is doubtful if all the enjoyment and all the admiration will bring conviction that its thesis is true.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

PROFESSOR RADHAKRISHNAN SPEAKS

Having accepted from McGill University the honour of inaugurating in Montreal the Beatty Memorial Lectures, Professor Radhakrishnan has published the first series of lectures—*East and West: Some Reflections* (Allen and Unwin; 6s. net). The first two lectures are mainly historical, and the range is too wide to enable him to do full justice either to his subject or himself; the whole of modern science and philosophy, for example, could hardly be dealt with adequately in twelve pages even by a man with the encyclopaedic knowledge and phenomenal memory of Professor Radhakrishnan. But the concluding lecture is excellent and inspiring. The lecturer, as befits the Vice-President of India, conceives of himself as an ambassador between East and West, but first of all establishes the apparent paradox that there is no East and West and that the tensions of the modern world are not geographical; they arise from the failure, common to all people in varying degrees, to give supremacy to the spirit over the material and the mental. It is only in the harmony of body, mind and spirit that the tensions can be resolved, and every culture has within it the power of progressively realising the value of the spiritual.

He combats the idea that the conflict with Communism is due to the Eastern affiliations of Russia, and holds that it is purely a Western tension. He is faithful to the Indian idea of the equality of all religions, and regards this as a necessary outcome of broad-minded tolerance. His ideal, whether for religion or politics, is peaceful co-existence, and he supports this view with many striking epigrammatic statements, although it is hardly consistent with his prevailing fair-mindedness to say that 'either-or' is the dominant pattern of Western culture and statecraft. His presentation of Christianity is rather too much influenced by views which were current fifty years ago, but can hardly now be regarded as typical. He finds it difficult to accept the importance of the historical basis of Christianity, arguing that it is impossible for us to be guided now by what happened two thousand years ago. He so emphasises the power of self-development and soul-control which is inherent in every man that he is unreceptive to the necessity or possibility of a redemptive Divine incursion into the world of human history. But this reluctance is the consequence of the denial, so pervasive in Indian thought, of full reality to the world of human experience. It is also the outcome of insufficient consideration given to the Christian doctrine of Incarnation—'the Word made flesh,' although this again, on the deepest level, is in accord with, and affords a metaphysical basis for, the ideal of a harmony of body, mind and spirit, which in general, and most sympathetically and persuasively, Professor Radhakrishnan advocates as

a solution of the ills of humanity and the only security for the peace of the world.

W. S. URQUHART

MODERN THEOLOGY

Subject and Object in Modern Theology, by Dr. James Brown (S.C.M. ; 18s. net), is a most interesting work. One thing that makes it interesting is that the author would obviously have no objection to being called a philosophical theologian. ' Theology,' he writes, ' may be more or less philosophical : it is entirely doubtful whether it can cease to be philosophical without ceasing to be what has hitherto been known as theology ' (p. 16). There are philosophers and philosophers, and it is one of the merits of Dr. Brown's book that its author, being familiar both with classical philosophers like Kant and Hegel, and with those like Buber and Sartre who arouse interest among theologians to-day, is able to compare the first set with the second. Just occasionally one has the suspicion that he finds links between the two that are not really there. To the writer, who has heard Martin Buber talk on Hegel, it seems strange that Dr. Brown should write : ' In the end, is Buber merely an existentialist veneer upon Hegel ? ' It is true, as Dr. Brown says, that parts of ' I and Thou ' leave one with the impression of pantheism. Yet there is not much doubt that Buber, with all his criticisms of Kierkegaard, is on the latter's side in his attack against Hegel.

On the Kierkegaard-Hegel issue Dr. Brown writes well, making it clear that Kierkegaard, with his profound admiration of Socrates, is not the man to lead a cheap campaign for the de-Hellenization of Christianity. Yet did not Kierkegaard break with something characteristically Greek when he put the thinking of the actor above that of the spectator ? It is interesting that Dr. Brown rather tends to qualify Werner Brock's elucidation of *Existenz* as the kind of thinking we go through when we have a profound decision to make. In this he may be right, but I do not think it is quite fair to hint as Dr. Brown seems to do on p. 47 that, on Brock's interpretation, existential thinking involves a putting of the reasons of the heart above those of the head.

Dr. Brown's treatment of Barth is sympathetic without being uncritical. One wishes that he had dealt with Heidegger at first hand and written about Jaspers. A comparison of these two writers would probably have led him to say something more about the influence of phenomenology on existentialism, a subject on which one would have liked to have had more than a brief if valuable discussion on pp. 183 and 184. But where much has been given it is unfair to complain for lack of more. Dr. Brown's book is a valuable contribution to the interpretation of modern theology. Every chapter can be read with profit.

IAN HENDERSON

ISLAM AND CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY

Professor J. Windrow Sweetman has just published the third volume of his work, *Islam and Christian Theology* (Part II. Vol. 1 ; Lutterworth Press ; 31s. 6d. net), the first two of which were published in 1945 and 1947. The whole is to be divided into three parts—Origins, Mediæval Development, and the Critical Reconstruction. In the two volumes of Part I he surveyed the development of Muslim theology up to the tenth century in relationship to Christianity in the Near East, and in Part II he is covering roughly the period from the tenth to the fourteenth centuries. The present volume gives an account of the relations between both the Eastern and the Western Church and Islam, showing how in the early period, the Western Church, in contrast to the Eastern, had little real knowledge of Islam. He then describes how the Dominicans and Franciscans eventually studied Islam, and this leads to the Polemical Climax which occupies about two-thirds of the book.

A very valuable feature of this work is the author's practice of giving summaries of the books he discusses, thus making available material which would not otherwise be readily accessible. In the main section of the book he summarizes the polemical writings of two Christians and two Muslims, adding his own comments from time to time. The Christians are Ricoldo of Montecroce (1243–1320) and Nicholas of Cusa (1401–1464). Ricoldo, a Dominican missionary in Baghdad, wrote in condemnation of Islam. Nicholas wrote two books, one an irenical tract, the other a work of trenchant criticism. It should be said, however, that while the first was written for Muslims, the second was for the information of the Pope and his advisers. The two Muslims are Ibn Ḥazm (993–1064) and al-Ghazālī (1058–1111). The interesting feature of their work is the knowledge of the Bible which they possess, although their approach is very different. Ibn Ḥazm is mainly concerned to point out contradictions in the Scriptures, and so prove that they are not the books which God revealed, but have been corrupted by Jews and Christians. Al-Ghazālī, on the other hand, never suggests that there has been any tampering with Scripture. He quotes passages and interprets them to show that they do not teach such doctrines as the Trinity, or the divinity of Christ. While at times he indicates his horror of certain Christian doctrines, he tries to argue calmly.

Dr. Sweetman has produced a work of great learning, and at the same time of great lucidity. But while the body of the work shows very careful scholarship, the book is marred by quite considerable carelessness in the transliteration of Arabic words and names. In a footnote on p. 178 there is an error in transliteration, accompanied by a wrong translation of the title of an Arabic work, and on p. 307, line 3 the English words in brackets translating Arabic words should be transposed. While such errors are to be regretted, they will not seriously disturb the general reader who does not know Arabic. This is an important work to be followed soon, one hopes, by the second volume of Part II which is to discuss the development of systematic theology and deal with parallels between scholastic thought in Christianity and Islam.

JAMES ROBSON

The debt of the Wesleys to the Moravians has been amply recognized, and many modern Christians have hailed the Moravian Church as the greatest of all missionary churches, regard being had to its numbers. Not so many however realize that the Moravians did not begin with Zinzendorf in the eighteenth century, but that before him they had had a long and glorious history, going back beyond the Reformation to 1457 when in the village of Kunwald there was formed from among the spiritual sons of John Huss a church fellowship which, after it had been joined by others of similar views further afield, became known as 'The Unity of the Brethren' or 'The United Brethren.'

In view of the five hundredth anniversary of this event there has been published a *History of the Moravian Church*, by the Rev. Edward Langton, D.D., F.R.Hist.S. (Allen and Unwin; 12s. 6d. net). The author, who is not himself a Moravian, writes with sympathetic though not uncritical appreciation of what he calls 'The First International Protestant Church,' in whose story are unequalled records of heroic venture and endurance. This is a useful book which supplies a felt need.

Thomas Cranmer, the quater-centenary of whose martyrdom falls this year, was rather a scholar than a creative theologian, yet, as a key figure in the English Reformation, he influenced English religion theologically through his part in the Prayer Book, the Articles and the Homilies; and the value of his work still affords grounds for difference of opinion. We welcome therefore *Thomas Cranmer Theologian*, by the Rev. G. W. Bromiley, D.Litt. (Lutterworth Press; 12s. 6d. net). Dr. Bromiley gives a critical but constructive exposition of Cranmer's views on the important subjects—Scripture and Tradition, Justification, Church and Ministry, Baptism and the Eucharist. It is a testimony to the author's mastery of his material that, while his subject is Cranmer the theologian, he contrives incidentally to show us Cranmer the Reformer with his blindness to the Erastian issue, his genius for liturgical forms, his scholarly piety nourished on Scripture which gave him insights which are still valid for the formulation of religious truth. With its index, bibliography and constant reference to the sources this is a useful book, written in clear and orderly fashion.

Preaching the Gospel from the Gospels, by the Rev. G. R. Beasley-Murray (Lutterworth Press; 8s. 6d. net), is an expansion of a series of lectures given at various times to associations of lay preachers in the Baptist and Congregational Churches. Surely there can never have been a more closely packed book than this. It consists of five chapters—Preaching and the Writing of the Gospels, The Gospel in the Life of Jesus, The Gospel in the Miracles of Jesus, The Gospel in the Teaching of Jesus, The Gospel in the Parables of Jesus. An amazing amount of ground is covered, and it is true to say that Dr. Beasley-Murray touches nothing which he does not illuminate and adorn. The chapter on the life of Jesus is notably good, for the drama of Jesus' life is magnificently sketched. The chapter on The Gospel in the Parables of Jesus is notably good. The most unsatisfactory chapter is The Gospel in the Miracles of Jesus. Dr. Beasley-Murray writes out of the widest and the most up-to-date knowledge, but also from a very conservative point of view, and that chapter is least satisfying to the mind. But this is a book which no preacher would wish to criticise, for this is a book in which the preacher will find that every sentence will expand into a sermon—and who can fail to be grateful for a book like that?

The Secretary's Handbook: A Guide to Sunday School Work, by Ernest H. Hayes and Roland Atkinson (Methodist Youth Department; 3s. net), is an extremely practical and helpful book. It is written in the conviction that 'the secretary can make or mar the work of a Sunday School,' and that, 'whoever aspire to take any part in the winning of children for the Kingdom of God should bring to that work not only a spirit of devotion but also a determination to be efficient.' This book not only describes the work of the secretary; it also continually stresses the personal

qualities of the secretary. The great virtue of this book is that its head is never in the clouds, and that it is not afraid to say the simplest and the most practical things. 'If you are writing to ask a favour, and need a reply, enclose a stamped addressed envelope.' 'When telephoning try to choose the time you think is convenient for the other party; avoid meal times, or when there is a special item on the radio or television programme. To ring and ask a favour at an inconvenient time will not predispose people to grant your request!' This is a thoroughly useful book, and happy indeed will be the Sunday School which is blessed with a secretary such as it describes.

This series of lectures—*The Philosophical Movement in the Thirteenth Century*, by Professor Fernand Van Steenberghen (Nelson; 15s. net)—delivered at Queen's University, Belfast, discusses in a most interesting manner the philosophico-religious thought of the 'great century' of scholasticism. The author is controversial on several points, and makes out a good case for his own position, which is that the philosophy of the period is not so exclusively based on Aristotelianism as is commonly supposed. Many trends of thought, arising from Platonism, Neo-Platonism and especially from the Augustinian tradition, have brought their contribution. Towards the end of the period Thomism, which occupied a middle position between heterodoxy and orthodoxy, seemed to be vanquished by Augustinianism, but this was only a temporary set-back, and in reality the influence of Thomas Aquinas persisted far into the future. In his conclusion the author crosses swords with Professor Gilson as to the latter's confident reference to the development of a *Christian* philosophy, and argues that what is wanted for the modern world is not a Christian but a *true* philosophy. The philosopher, he contends, is not good as a philosopher because he is a good theologian; rather, if he is a good philosopher, he is likely to be a good theologian. But surely there is no reason whatsoever why a Christian philosophy should not be a true philosophy provided it is not assumed at the outset that it is a true philosophy *because* it is a Christian philosophy.

Epistles to the Philippians and Colossians, by the Rev. W. E. Vine, M.A. (Oliphants; 12s. 6d. net), is a commentary on these two Epistles. The commentary deals with the Epistles verse by verse. It is specially strong on the meaning of Greek words which it transliterates frequently into English spelling. Of the two sections of this commentary that on Colossians is far the better. The commentary on Philippians never really rises above the obvious; that on the much more difficult Epistle to the Colossians is much more helpful.

On p. 160 *exaleipō* should be *exaleiphō*; and on p. 167 *epichorōgia* should be *epichorēgia*.

In our opinion this is a useful book, but the price, as it stands, is too high for what it has to offer.

The veteran Rev. W. Graham Scroggie, D.D.—he will soon be, if spared, an octogenarian—has issued a revised edition of a little book which he produced quite a number of years ago—*Method in Prayer* (Pickering and Inglis; 6s. net). He deals in turn with the great parts of prayer—adoration, confession, petition, intercession, and thanksgiving.

If any kind of Christian utterance can get home to ordinary people to-day it must be somehing like *The Faith We Have to Proclaim*, by the Rev. R. Leonard Small (Saint Andrew Press; 1s. 6d. net). It consists of four addresses, given first over the radio we suspect, in furtherance of the 'Tell Scotland' campaign. The minister of Cramond is a born preacher who uses clear and downright speech, while his own buoyant faith suffuses the whole.

The Claims of Christ: A Study in His Self-Portraiture, by the Rev. Hugh Martin, C.H., D.D. (S.C.M.; 7s. net), packs a great deal into a very short compass. Dr. Martin's conviction is that 'the heart of the Christian faith is not in its moral outlook, of which it has no monopoly; nor in its theism, which it shares with Judaism and Islam.' 'The Christian faith is not philosophy or ethics but belief in the intervention of God in the Person of Jesus, and acceptance in thought and life of the consequence that flows from that belief.' Jesus did not say 'Do you agree with what I say?' but, 'Who do you say that I am?' That being so, it is of paramount importance to try to understand Jesus' own self-consciousness. The great value of this book is that it is Biblical theology at its best. Whatever else it does or does not do, it amasses the evidence from the Gospels for everything with which it deals and for everything it says. One of the wisest things it says is: 'The characteristic Christian affirmation is not so much that Jesus is divine as that God is Christian.' 'God,' as Denney said, 'would be a word of another meaning to us but for Him.'

This is a really helpful book. Many who are not trained theologians will find help in this little book when they would be merely bewildered by much bigger and more learned volumes.

The Interpretation of Psalm lxxiii. 24

By the Reverend Professor S. Jellicoe, M.A., D.D., Bishop's University, Lennoxville, Canada

The recently published Volume IV. of *The Interpreter's Bible*, covering the Books of Psalms and Proverbs, serves to invite attention once again to the long-standing problem of the meaning to be attached to אַחַר כָּבוֹד in Ps 73[24], a psalm which has the distinction, rare within the canonical writings of the Old Testament, of giving sanctuary to a possible allusion to a future life for the individual. The verse reads as follows in M.T. :

בַּעֲצָתְךָ תַנְחֵנִי וְאַחַר כָּבוֹד תִּקָּחֵנִי׃

literally, 'With thy counsel thou wilt lead me; and after glory thou wilt take me.'

In his exegetical notes Dr. W. S. McCullough remarks upon the unusual form of the text, of which no proposed emendation has met with general acceptance. He construes both אַחַר and כָּבוֹד adverbially, the latter as an adverbial accusative—'gloriously' or 'in honour'—and concludes that 'Hebrew poetical parallelism suggests that the clause should be rendered "and afterward thou wilt lead me in honour."' The 'alternative exegesis' that the verse is an expression of the psalmist's hope that God's guidance of him will continue after death is nevertheless given full weight and left an open question.[1]

While there is considerable support for the adverbial use of אַחַר[2]—'afterwards'—it is difficult to defend the adverbial construing of כָּבוֹד 'gloriously' or 'with glory' as, for example, Vulgate, R.V.m, P.B.V., Canadian B.C.P. (Draft Revision, 1955), Kirkpatrick,[3] Oesterley,[4] S. R. Driver,[5] following LXX *μετὰ δόξης*; and even less satisfactory is the translation 'to glory' or 'unto glory' as A.V., R.V., Briggs,[6] T. H. Robinson,[7] and more recently R.S.V. [1952] and S. Terrien.[8] The most that can be claimed for the foregoing is that they attempt an intelligible rendering of the Hebrew text as it stands.

[1] *The Interpreter's Bible*, iv. [1955] 391.

[2] *B.D.B.*, s.v., 1b.

[3] *The Book of Psalms* [1902].

[4] *The Psalms* [1939]. Commentary on this Psalm contributed by T. H. Robinson (see p. vii.).

[5] *The Parallel Psalter* [2] [1904].

[6] *I.C.C.*

[7] Essay, 'The Eschatology of the Psalmists' in *The Psalmists*, ed. D. C. Simpson [1926], 106.

[8] *The Psalms and Their Meaning for To-day* [1952], 259.

Many have felt, however, with Edwyn Bevan [9] that the text of *v.* 24 is so 'meaningless' and 'obviously corrupt' that they have been compelled to resort to emendation. Of those which have been proposed that of Heinrich Grätz in his *Kritischer Kommentar* [1882–3] (וְאַחֲרֶיךָ בְיָד תּ״) has met with some favour. It involves little interference with the text, demanding only the insertion of a *yodh*, the substitution of a *yodh* for a *waw* and a redivision of the consonants, but its weakness lies in the fact (as noted by Briggs, *op. cit.*) that the usage cannot be paralleled in Biblical Hebrew. Nor has the proposal to read אֹרַח for אַחַר, though finding place side by side with that of Grätz in Kittel (*BH*[3]), met with general acceptance.[10]

The matter has again been taken up of late by Professor Sheldon H. Blank of the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, to whom the present writer is indebted for the courtesy of a copy of his article and a private communication. Dr. Blank has made the Psalm with its theme of 'the nearness of God' the subject of a penetrating study contributed to a volume of essays in honour of Charles Lynn Pyatt.[11] Setting the verse against the background of the whole Psalm he makes it his object to 'attempt to find the reading which best suits the thought structure as well as the literary form of the composition' and suggests the emendation וְאַחֲרֶךָ תַּדְבְּקֵנִי 'guiding me by thy counsel, keeping me near,' literally 'and behind thee thou makest me to cleave.' This emendation, though necessarily precluding any allusion to life after death, is preferable to that of Grätz: it involves the omission of one consonant (*heth*) from MT together with the restoration of *taw* and *beth* to what Dr. Blank supposes to have been their original position and from which they have been accidentally transposed, but has the merit, as the writer demonstrates, of being good idiomatic Biblical Hebrew.[12]

[9] *Journal of Theological Studies*, xliii. [1942], 81.

[10] See, for this and further emendations based upon it, Beer in *Z.A.W.* xxi. [1901], 77 f.; Commentaries of Cheyne [1904], and Gunkel [1926]; G. R. Driver, in *Journal of Theological Studies*, xliv. [1943], 12 f.

[11] Essay, 'The Nearness of God and Psalm Seventy-Three,' in *To Do and To Teach* [1953].

[12] A *yodh* would have stood after *resh* in the original text, the present text (according to Dr. Blank's hypothesis) being an attempt to make sense out of the confusion arising from the accidental transposition of the *taw* and *beth*.

In view, however, of the fact that the identical phrase אַחַר כָּבוֹד is found elsewhere in the Old Testament, namely Zech 2^{12} (^{8} E. VV.] one is constrained to ask whether resort to emendation is really the solution. Is there not rather the possibility that in the light of the Zechariah passage a satisfactory interpretation of Ps 73^{24b} might be attainable? In Zech 2^{12} which reads 'For thus saith Jahveh of Hosts, After glory hath he sent me unto the nations which spoiled you . . .' the clause אַחַר כָּבוֹד שְׁלָחַנִי (which might be paraphrased 'following upon a vision in which he [Jahveh] appeared to me hath he sent me') forms a parenthesis attesting the grounds of the prophet's commission and authority. Precedent is to be found in varying measure in (1) the call of the patriarchs Abraham (Gn 12^{7}), Isaac (Gn 26^{24}), Jacob (Gn $28^{10ff.}$); (2) the theophany to Moses at the bush (Ex $12^{2ff.}$) and on Sinai (Ex $33^{12ff.}$); (3) the vision and call of Isaiah (Is 6); and (4) Ezekiel's inaugural and subsequent visions (Ezk 1–3, 8, 10, 11, etc.). In the foregoing instances כָּבוֹד occurs in Ex $33^{18.\ 22}$, Is 6^{3}, Ezk 1^{28} 3^{23} (*bis*) 10^{4} (*bis*) $11^{22f.}$ *et al.* This term, as H. G. Mitchell has pointed out, becomes synonymous, when it refers to the Deity, with the manifestation of Jahveh, a meaning frequent in the Old Testament.[1]

The case of Ezekiel is of particular significance, Zechariah's phraseology having been suggested, as H. G. Mitchell postulates, by the similarity of his own experience to that of his predecessor as recorded in the opening chapters of his book (Ezk 1 and 2), an experience of which Ezekiel has treated as fully as words would allow, but 'which he might have condensed, and Zechariah did condense, into the brief statement, *After the glory* (vision) *he sent me.*'[2]

In the light of the foregoing it would appear that in Ps 73^{24} the writer, who throughout his life had enjoyed communion with God and the guidance of His counsel, envisages finally a theophany in which Jahveh will appear to him and 'take' him, a thought in line with, though an advance upon, Ps 49^{16} (^{15}) where the simple hope is expressed that the psalmist will be 'taken' (לָקַח)[3] without any reference to the manner. Again, the claim has affinity with Job 19^{25-27}, though excelling it in quality. Job's vision is to be merely vindicatory and apparently momentary[4]: indeed Job seems less concerned with personal communion with Jahveh than with his own justification. But in Ps 73 the writer combines in synthetic parallelism the conviction that Jahveh, his life-long counsellor, not only will appear to him but will also as in the case of Enoch 'take' (לָקַח) him to Himself (Gn 5^{24}). The thought contributes nothing as to the *nature* of the future life, nor is this necessarily to be sought: it is the expression of the hope, or rather of that quiet confidence, imparting the strength to withstand any temptation to falter in face of the arrogancy and apparent prosperity of the transgressor.

This appears to be the natural meaning of the passage, an interpretation which renders emendation misplaced and is in harmony with, and indeed climactic to, all that has gone before, and is moreover difficult to dismiss save on the assumption that the psalmist at the particular stage at which he wrote (which in turn involves a decision on the elusive problem of dating) could not have conceived of a fellowship with Jahveh which would survive the failure of 'flesh and heart.' Such is a hazardous method of exegesis bringing back, as it would, the application of an evolutionary theory which has been well described as a 'cardinal error'[5] and is falling more and more into desuetude.[6]

[1] *Zechariah* in *I.C.C.*, 141. See also on the term G. B. Gray in *E.Bi*, article 'Theophany,' § 6, and more fully the same writer in *H.D.B.*, ii., article 'Glory.'

[2] *Op. cit.*, 141 f.

[3] Köhler-Baumgartner, *Lex. in V.T. Libros* [1953], seems to recognize a quasi-technical sense attaching to this verb (=*entrücken*) in Gn 5^{24}, 2 K 2^{3}, Ps 49^{16} 73^{24} (p. 485b).

[4] R. H. Charles, *Eschatology* [2] [1913], 71; Driver and Gray, *Job* in *I.C.C.*, 171–173.

[5] Paul Radin, *Monotheism among Primitive Peoples* [2] [1954], 27.

[6] See, for example, *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, ed. H. H. Rowley [1951], pp. xvi. (Rowley); 60, 62 (C. R. North); 193 (A. R. Johnson); 284, 287, 289, 303, 309 (G. W. Anderson); 312, 316 (N. W. Porteous).

Bernard Shaw and the Preacher

By Captain the Reverend J. A. Davidson, B.A., B.D., Royal Canadian Army Chaplain Corps, Picton, Ontario

I

Nearly fifty years ago A. G. Gardiner wrote this about Bernard Shaw: 'He is a hurricane on two legs—a hurricane of wrath flashing through our jerry-built society. He is the lash laid across the back of his generation. He whips us with the scorpions of his bitter pen, and we are grateful. He flings his withering gibes in our faces, and we laugh. He lampoons us in plays and we fight at the pay box. We love him as Bill Sykes' dog loved that hero—because he beats us.'

That hurricane was of long duration, and even now, in the sixth year after Shaw's death, it continues to blow. The lash of Shaw has been laid across the backs of the two generations which succeeded Gardiner's—and the lashing continues.

During the past half-century Bernard Shaw has been a significant ingredient of the intellectual ferment, and it seems safe to predict that his influence will continue. His plays are studied in schools and universities throughout the world. They are regularly revived in the West End and on Broadway and in films, and every amateur dramatic group feels that it must do a Shaw from time to time. On the occasion of Shaw's ninetieth birthday 'Penguin' published two million copies of his plays, and has been reprinting them in substantial editions since then. The standard editions of his various works continue to sell well.

Preachers and other religious leaders must concern themselves about Shaw, for sooner or later bits of the Shavian philosophy and theology will be thrust at them, either as query or as challenge.

Shaw's religious attitudes are confusing. It should not be forgotten that his first published 'work' was a letter written to a Dublin newspaper in 1875 when he was eighteen, which was a carefully reasoned objection to the methods of Moody and Sankey in a 'revival' they conducted in Dublin. In his will he declared: 'I desire that no public monument or work of art or inscription or sermon or ritual service commemorating me shall suggest that I accepted the tenets particular to any established church or denomination, nor take the form of a cross or any other instrument of torture or symbol of blood sacrifice.' His attitude towards Christianity, or, at least, toward modern institutional Christianity, is expressed in words he gives to Lentullus, a young Roman aristocrat, in *Androcles and the Lion*: 'Christians, by Jove! Let's chaff them.' Some of his chaffing was quite wholesome and salutary. For example, he pointed out that, 'a popular pulpit may be as perilous to a man's soul as an imperial throne.' And there is some sharp, if unpleasant, truth in this note on the ministry: 'The average clergyman is an official who makes his living by christening babies, marrying adults, conducting a ritual, and making the best he can (where he has any conscience about it) of a certain routine of school superintendence, district visiting, organizing of almsgiving, which does not necessarily touch Christianity at any point except the point of the tongue.'

II

But beyond the chaffing, and sometimes within it, is the body of thought on religion with which we have to come to terms. Already there must be academic theses safely interred in university and seminary libraries which purport to analyze and assess the religious thought of Bernard Shaw. I suspect that the weakest sections of all of them are the attempts to reduce the Shavian thought to a consistent system. Or perhaps I should admit that I am unable to determine exactly what is the religious thought of Shaw, and simply echo William Temple who said of him: 'I do not profess to understand him, I only profess to enjoy his plays. He is, I am sure, passionately in earnest; but I can never find out what he is in earnest about, and I don't believe that he can either.'

Shaw was not a systematic thinker, and he was not always logical, but his work was marked by an emotional consistency which showed his fundamental integrity. We dare not dismiss him too easily. We must at least try to detect the trend of his religious thought, for it is much too effectively presented to be brushed aside lightly. It seems fashionable nowadays among the theologically-minded to dismiss Shaw as an amusing but bothersome old charlatan who may have written some vastly entertaining plays but who counts for very little

intellectually. That may or may not be a fair evaluation—but it certainly is unrealistic to use that as an excuse for ignoring Shaw. His religious thought may be, in the long run, quite unimportant (as I think it is)—but it is so attractively packaged that we must pay attention to it.

(*a*) I dare not try to give an account of Shaw's *doctrine of God*. I cannot claim to understand it—and I think that I am here in the company of the Vicar of Ayot St. Lawrence who told the press that Shaw was not an atheist when he visited him shortly before his death! Shaw introduced the philosophy, or theology, of the Life-Force in *Man and Superman*, and gave further expression to it in other works, notably *Back to Methuselah*. I have to confess that although I have wrestled with this philosophy at considerable length its full meaning eludes me, but I take it to be a doctrine having very little in common with the Christian doctrine of God. Shaw had a genius for being outrageously obscure in the clearest, most straightforward language—and in no place is this displayed more effectively than in his passages on the Life-Force.

The eminent literary critic, A. C. Ward, in his *Twentieth-Century Literature*, wrote that 'Though Shaw's Life Force is not anthropomorphic, in its functions it is not vastly different from the Christian idea of the function of the Holy Ghost. It might be described as the Holy Ghost denuded of personality—IT, not *He*.' Shaw himself suggested this curious identification of the Life-Force with the Holy Ghost in *Back to Methuselah*. Mr. Ward, like Shaw, has, I fear, grossly misunderstood the Christian experience of the Holy Spirit and the doctrine (except in an extravagantly 'liberal' form) which rises out of that experience. Shaw's notion of the Life-Force perhaps has certain superficial resemblances to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as stated in its most general form. But that element of particularity which is of the heart of the Christian doctrine finds no place in Shavian thought, nor does he give any consideration to the correlative and essential Christian notions of *grace* and *revelation*.

In one of his *Broadcast Talks* C. S. Lewis spoke of the Life-Force (or creative evolution) philosophy, of which 'the wittiest expressions come in the works of Mr. G. B. Shaw.' Lewis comments on this form of pseudo-theism as follows: 'One reason why so many people find Creative Evolution so attractive is that it gives one much of the emotional comfort of believing in God and none of the less pleasant consequences. . . . The Life-Force is a sort of *tame* God. *You* can switch *it* on when you want *it*, but *it* won't bother *you*.' 'All the thrills of religion and none of the cost' is Mr. Lewis's assessment. And then he asks, 'Is the Life-Force the greatest achievement of wishful thinking the world has yet seen?'

G. K. Chesterton once said that 'Shaw is best described as a heathen mystic'; and the quasi-theistic undertones of his romantic biology seem to justify that description. Pantheism, however garnished, can never have more than a superficial resemblance to Christian theism. A facile unitarianism of the third Person is not the Christian doctrine of God.

(*b*) Shaw's *Christology* is of the Jesus-of-history kind in its simplest form. Schweitzer's dictum that 'there is no historical task which so reveals a man's true self as the writing of a life of Jesus,' is illustrated in the comments on the life and teachings of our Lord which form a good part of the Preface to *Androcles and the Lion*. Shaw's discussion tells us very little about Jesus but tells us a great deal about Shaw. Shaw's quick wit and forceful style always bewitch me, and as I read that Preface I am tempted blasphemously to picture the Master as an elderly Irish Fabian with piercing eyes and long white beard!

Any first-year divinity student should be able to point out the gross inadequacies of the Preface to *Androcles*. It is theologically naïve. But we cannot ignore the Preface. It is exceedingly well written. And we must not forget that it is the only New Testament criticism which some of the most intelligent people will read and that Shaw compels people by his literary dexterity to accept his conclusions. This is part of the Shavian theology which we have to face—even though his name may not be mentioned in connexion with it. For example, in this Preface he goes on to draw sharp distinctions between Christianity and what he calls Crosstianity and Churchianity. Such distinctions may seem crude and silly to any one theologically trained but the man-in-the-street (and the man-in-the-pew) may think them quite clever.

III

I do not suggest that we should become excited over the religious thought of Bernard Shaw. He made no significant contribution to the study of religion. The theologian as such can safely ignore him—although a careful study of his prose style might have a salutary effect on contemporary theological writing! But we must be aware of Shaw's religious thought, for it is a persisting element in our intellectual environment. And, furthermore, it is a bracing experience for a preacher to come to grips with Shaw's opinions and to attempt to answer them with the felicitousness and force with which Shaw propounded them.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

The New Look

By H. F. Mathews, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., Alsager, Cheshire

'Wherefore if any man is in Christ, he is a new creature.'—2 Co 5^{17} (R.V.).

We have been short of vegetables at home this winter. Last year I had as fine a show of young brassica as you could wish, April-sown, pricked out in late May, transplanted to well dug soil in July, according to all the rules in the gardening books. Then we went away for our holiday.

When we came back, young Georgina from over the wall said, 'There have been some lovely white butterflies on your allotment.' Had there now! Sure enough, every plant had nestling in its foliage a mass of tiny, dark green eggs. I poked out as many as I could, but a few days of bright sunshine turned them into wriggling caterpillars—thousands of them. They nibbled and chewed and grew fat. My friends gave me plenty of advice. But nothing did much good. The caterpillars finished every single cabbage.

Now I am a simple, unscientific soul. So after the children were asleep, I stole into their bedroom and looked up their junior encyclopædia. I found all about the white butterflies in a simple little article entitled 'The Metamorphosis of Lepidoptera,' which would, of course, be child's play to you. Apparently the beautiful butterfly lays her eggs in a juicy cabbage, and when they hatch out they are not butterflies, as any self-respecting creatures would be. They have a new look. They are caterpillars. They eat until they take on another new look, and then they become the sleeping-houses of next year's butterflies, which will begin the trouble all over again. It is a shameful deception that the silky, fluttering wings should be a disguise for a beastly, ravenous insect.

Sometimes humans take on a new look which is equally distressing. I have known boys come to school with splendid promise. But they have got into the wrong company, and soon they have turned into wastrels and nuisances. I have known youth clubs which started with high idealism. But soon the ideals have been forgotten; the quiet discussions in the lounge have lapsed, the epilogue has become a formal, meaningless ritual, and the club has become nothing but an excuse to bang ping-pong balls about. It is a shame, the way in which the good and the lovely so often become the wrong and the ugly.

But there is a happier truth in this metamorphosis business. And that is what the Bible is all about. It tells us of the miracles by which God makes good folk out of bad folk, sons of the Kingdom out of ordinary men. Turn its pages and see how Jesus changed the mean little publican of Capernaum into Matthew the Apostle; how He made Mary, the careless girl from Magdala, into the loving woman who found her Master in the Garden on the morning of Easter Day; how He turned the narrow-minded Pharisee undergraduate from Tarsus into Paul, the missionary to the Gentiles. That is the new look which Christ can give—and still does give to every one who puts his trust in Him. Paul knew all about it. It is just like becoming a new creature.

Seven Whole Days

By the Reverend Eric Jones, Glasgow

Last summer our Sunday School went to Inverkip. When the games and tea were over we all went down to the sea before catching the train home. It was then that I spotted a notice in a shop window. It said 'Chimneys swept on Fridays.' Think of that, boys and girls. At Inverkip you can only have your chimneys swept on Fridays!

Of course the reason will be that the sweep only visits Inverkip on that one day in the week. On other days he will be in other villages. Even so, that notice made me think.

There are some people who will only do certain things on certain days. I once heard of two elderly ladies from a village in England who went to stay in London for a few days. London impressed them and so did the fine hotel where they stayed. They were particularly impressed with the fact that they each had a bathroom, with a bath, leading from their bedrooms. They often mentioned this fact as they talked together and even mentioned it on postcards sent to the friends at home! After three days' stay they went home on a Thursday. When they reached their home village they were asked how they had liked their holiday. 'It was wonderful,' they said, 'and the hotel was marvellous. We each had a bath to ourselves and the only thing that makes us sorry now is that we did not book until the Saturday so that we could have had a bath on the Friday

night!' You see, they felt that Friday night was the only possible night on which to have a bath!

We know better than that, don't we? But there are some boys and girls who make a greater mistake than that. They think that Sunday is the only day for prayer and praise and Bible reading.

We should praise God every day, and pray every day and read our Bibles every day. George Herbert was right when he said,

Seven whole days, not one in seven,
I will praise thee.

The Christian Year

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER

At the End of our Tether

BY THE REVEREND J. ITHEL JONES, M.A., B.D., LONDON

'We believe now that we had this experience of coming to the end of our tether that we might learn to trust, not in ourselves, but in God who can raise the dead'—2 Co 1^9 (Phillips).

'At the end of our tether.' Of course, we often imagine we are there when we are not, really. We say, 'I'm nearly at the end of my tether,' when really all that has happened is that we have become rather over-tired or that we have accumulated a far too heavy programme for the coming week. But there are among the readers of these words those who have at some time or another reached the point where they could truly say, 'I am at the end of my tether.' The point made here is that that experience was given you in order that you might learn a new trust. It is a case of man's extremity becoming God's opportunity.

Of course, we must be very careful where and how we say this. It is perfectly all right for us to take this truth for ourselves. We should not be too ready to offer it to others. Never say to your neighbour, 'God allowed you to get to that point because you did not trust Him enough.' That would be the height of presumption. But if in our own case we are able to look back steadily and say quietly, 'Perhaps I reached that point because I needed to learn to lean harder,' it will doubtless turn to our salvation.

It is interesting to note the context in which Paul has set this saying. He speaks of 'the trouble . . . in Asia.' When we turn to Ac 19 and read of the incidents at Philippi we realize that 'the trouble' was a bout of persecution and imprisonment on account of the work of the gospel. And Paul is saying that this kind of thing was sent, or at least permitted, in order that he might trust God the more. What an extraordinary claim! I wonder if his thought is becoming excessively Hebrew just here? The characteristically Hebrew way of speaking would suggest that the difference between a 'purpose' clause and a 'consequence' clause was not as clear cut to the Jews as it is to us. Whether it is theologically defensible to say that God sends persecution in order that the persecuted may learn a new dependence upon Him is, to say the least, questionable. But that such trouble often results in a new trust no one would deny. The point here is that Paul was brought to the end of his tether and in that situation learnt a new trust in God.

That is the only place some of us can learn to trust God. Read Ps 107 at your leisure and there you will find a catalogue of such people. Note the recurring refrain, 'Then they cried unto the Lord in their trouble.' There you have a picture of men perfectly content to go on their way without God until they come to the end of their tether. It takes trouble, great trouble to turn some of us to God. It was at such a time of extremity that an overwhelming vision of God came to Isaiah. 'In the year that King Uzziah died I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up. . . .'

Can we interpret our experience in the light of all this? Hugh Redwood has suggested that when we come to the end of our tether we remember that God is at the other end. And what the experience really taught us was, that the tether does not break.

He drew me with the cords of love,
And thus He bound me to Him.

Paul interpreted his 'thorn in the flesh' in this light. It got him down. So much so that he called it 'a messenger of Satan to buffet me.' Three times he cried desperately to God for deliverance. What he got was, 'My grace is sufficient for thee.' Lean harder, Paul.

At a recent Watchnight Service, as we looked back over the old year, we used these prayers of thanksgiving: 'For the disciplines that have given a finer temper to our living; for the denial of gratifications in which we have recognized at length Thy wisdom and gracious providence; for the faith that gave us strength to walk in days of trial, WE GIVE THEE THANKS.' Are not these just our 'Amen' to the affirmation that coming to the end of our tether teaches us to trust not in ourselves, but in God who can raise the dead.

Have we caught the point of that last phrase—to trust 'in God who can raise the dead'? When a person comes to the end of his tether he asks whether God can really bring him through. It is all very well to quote verses like 'Our sufficiency is of God,' or 'His mercies fail not.' But when a

man is at the end of things, repeating verses of Scripture which were stored away in the mind in those halcyon days when all the world was young is not much point. A man needs to have the assurance in his own heart that God is absolutely supreme and that He is available. Where can he get that? How is he to know when he comes to the end of things that they are not beyond God? Now, perhaps, we see the point of describing God in this context as one 'Who can raise the dead.' Death is the seemingly final and ultimate fact with which man is confronted. 'Where there's life, there's hope,' we say. Does that mean that when death has taken possession things have gone too far even for God? No! The God in whom we are called to trust is one 'Who can raise the dead.' What Paul is doing here is arguing from the greater to the less. Can God bring you through? You have before you the fact of the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. If God achieved that, He can achieve anything. His power can meet any contingency. Lean hard, believer.

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER

St. Mark's Portrait of Christ

BY THE REVEREND JOHN L. RIACH, B.D., EDINBURGH

'What wisdom is this which is given unto him, that even such mighty works are wrought by his hands?'—Mk 6^2.

When the late Cosmo Lang was Archbishop of York Sir William Orpen was commissioned to paint his portrait. 'Which Archbishop am I to paint,' said the artist when confronted by Lang, 'for I see seven Archbishops.' What a many-sided thing is human nature; and the greater a person is the more facets are there to his personality. Thus, when we turn to Jesus of Nazareth, we discover that the sides to His being are legion. It is not surprising, therefore, that in the realm of art no two pictures of Jesus Christ are the same. All that each artist does is to fasten on one rich feature of that unique life and set that down on the canvas. The same holds good in the New Testament. All the writers deal with the one Lord, but the facet which appeals to one is not the same as that which catches the eye of another, with the result that the portraits of Jesus Christ which appear in the different books of the New Testament are rich in their variety. The portrait of the Master which Mark paints in his Gospel is different from that drawn by John in his divine pages; while Paul's portrait of Christ is far removed from that of the writer of Revelation. Suppose, then, we turn our attention to the original of all the Gospels, Mark. We find that the facet of Christ which rivets his attention is His mighty works; and so the portrait he gives us is that of Jesus Christ, the Man of action.

A few years ago there was published a little book entitled *Ideas That Have Moved the World*. In it, the author shows that many movements, like Trade Unionism, The League of Nations, Communism, and others, owe their origin to an idea—be the idea true or false. That is how it stands with the majority of movements, cults, institutions, and even religions. They are based upon an idea. What men in our day fail to see is that it is quite different with Christianity. This Faith is not founded on the speculative ideas of anybody, but upon certain mighty acts which took place on the stage of history. It is because of the mighty act of the Incarnation—that God actually came into this world in the person of Jesus of Nazareth when He was born in Bethlehem of Judea, and that when Jesus spoke it was God who is the Truth who spoke to the world—it is because of that act that we believe what we do about God, namely, that He loves us to distraction, cares for us individually, and exercises a wise providence over us. It is because of the mighty acts performed by Jesus during those three crowded years in Galilee healing ravaged bodies, relieving hunger, curing deranged minds, raising the very dead, that we believe that there is no limit to God's power and that He can do unbelievable things for us through faith and prayer. It is because of the mighty act of the Crucifixion that we believe in the greatest therapeutic power in existence—the forgiveness of sins—no matter how the various theories of the Atonement evolved by the theologians may conflict. It is because of the mighty act of the Resurrection on Easter Day that we believe in personal immortality and the communion of the saints, and conclude that Pascal had taken leave of his senses for the moment when he said, 'At last they throw a little earth on our faces and that is the end.' It is because of the mighty act of the Ascension—the raising of Jesus Christ to the right hand of God, the fitting climax to the whole Christian story—that we believe that good will triumph over evil and that the Kingdom of God will come in all its fullness when history, as we know it, reaches its end. Let there be no mistake! Our Christian Faith is not based on any speculative idea of an individual which may be totally or partially wrong. It is built upon certain mighty acts which took place on the stage of history and about which we have no dubiety.

Now, what John Mark is concerned to do in his Gospel is to emphasize these mighty acts upon which our Christian Faith is founded, and so he draws for us in his pages the portrait of the Christ

of the mighty works: Christ the man of action. Sit down and read the Gospel of Mark with its sixteen chapters right through. If you do, you will be struck by the fact that the Sermon on the Mount is conspicuous by its absence; and, what is more, though Mark admits that Jesus was prolific in His use of parables he records only four in his pages. The first eight chapters of this tiny book deal with the ministry in Galilee, and in them Mark sets forth no fewer than eighteen miracles performed by Jesus. The second half of the Gospel deals with the drama of Jesus' death; the events leading up to it, the happenings of Holy Week, the Crucifixion, the Resurrection and the Ascension. Look at the texture and construction of this Gospel and notice what it reveals. It is as though John Mark were saying to the world, 'I am not so much concerned with the words of Jesus of Nazareth, however important these be. It is the mighty deeds of this Man I would draw attention to. For this Christian Faith is not based on speculative ideas, but upon certain historical acts performed by God through Jesus Christ. Therefore, I present Jesus of Nazareth, the Man of action.'

At the present time we in the Christian Church are recapturing the sense of mission. Instead of going to worship and leaving the outsider to come in and join us if he cares to do so, we are going out into the homes of the people to challenge the lapsed, the indifferent, the disillusioned, and the faithless with the claims of the gospel. In this outgoing work we often encounter people who say to us, 'Why do you believe as you do?' What do we reply? Do we shuffle uncomfortably from one foot to another and merely mumble that we do not really know? One of the most telling answers is to say to such a questioner, 'Because of a man called John Mark.' Should he look puzzled, and demand what we mean, there is our opportunity to explain that our Holy Faith is built not on speculative ideas but upon mighty historical acts; and it is Mark who tells us in simple, graphic form what most of these mighty acts are in his portrait of Jesus Christ, the Man of action.

SUNDAY AFTER ASCENSION

The Prayer that Teaches To Pray

By the Reverend Roderick Bethune, M.A., Edinburgh

'And it came to pass, that, as he was praying in a certain place, when he ceased, one of his disciples said unto him, Lord, teach us to pray.'—Lk 11[1].

Alone of the four Evangelists St. Luke suggests that the Prayer which we know as The Lord's Prayer was spoken in direct response to a request on the part of one of His disciples, and he probably based his statement upon a tradition current in the Palestine of his day.

Accepting his suggestion, the question is: What prompted such a request? After all, the disciples were devout Jews who had taken part in synagogue and Temple services and had engaged in private devotion and so were already familiar with many set forms of prayer. Did it indicate simply a desire for such a prayer as noted Rabbis not uncommonly provided for their followers and which, succinctly, embodied their teaching? Some would answer that question in the affirmative, and quite understandably, for the narrative says that John the Baptist, in accordance with custom, had given his followers such a prayer, and that what he had done the disciples of Jesus desired their Master to do. But surely the request must also be considered against the background against which St. Luke sets it. The disciples had come upon our Lord praying. Conscious, it seems highly probable, from something in His face or in His general bearing that prayer meant and did something for Him which it had failed to mean and to do for them, they, it seems clear, felt urged to ask to be taught to pray, not just what to pray, but how to pray. It was instruction in the cultivation of the spiritual life which they wished.

Our Lord furnished them with a form of words which, for all its simplicity, contains the essence of His teaching about God and about God's relation to His world, about man's place in God's scheme of things and about man's fundamental needs and God's preparedness to meet them. Our very familiarity with the simple words which have been treasured and repeated through the centuries because they came from the lips of our Lord Himself may have obscured that fact from us. But let us think upon them anew and we find ourselves agreeing with Carlyle who, in a letter written shortly before he died, tells how, during a sleepless night, he set himself to think out the Lord's Prayer and at every point found himself carried beyond his depth.

But, besides containing the essence of His whole teaching, the simple form of words is seen to contain the concentrated thought of our Lord upon prayer in particular. If we would be taught to pray, it is to this Prayer we must turn.

1. *The simplicity of the form of words which our Lord provided for His men.* If the saint or sage can never exhaust this Prayer, a child can understand it sufficiently to make it his own. The message of its simplicity, therefore, must not be missed. For it is something which our Lord took pains to impress upon men elsewhere than in this Prayer. Some, He said, made long prayers, per-

suaded, obviously, that all that was required of them was that they should use devotional language and sufficient of it. Little wonder they found prayer of so little avail. At the same time, our Lord did not despise the treasury of devotion which was part of His people's heritage. On the contrary, He was steeped in it, as scholars, examining the several petitions of this Prayer and hearing in them echoes of Israel's treasury of devotion, have made clear. But, if He borrowed language He filled it with His own content. Prayer, He reminds us, is the simple, reverent, spontaneous, sincere expression of a man's heart. Has our prayer been that? If it hasn't, can we be surprised if prayer has meant less to us than it meant to our Lord?

2. *Our Lord's emphasis upon the attitude of trust in which a man must pray.* 'When ye pray,' He said, 'say Our Father which art in heaven.'

We are having communion with a God who, while high and lifted up, has respect unto the lowly, to whom each is known by name. To forget that, or to entertain doubts about it, must render our prayer null and void.

That is easily said, some may say. But a difficulty lies just here. The trouble is that sometimes God does seem remote and aloof. Is our difficulty, however, not an old difficulty, as old, at any rate, as the days of our Lord's first followers among whom was one who, feeling as *we* claim to feel, said to our Lord, 'Shew us the Father and it sufficeth us'? And does the way out of our difficulty not lie in remembering our Lord's answer to that plea—'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father'? We have need to remember as we ponder this Prayer that He who encourages us to approach God in an attitude of trust as 'Our Father which art in heaven,' Himself came to reveal God as Father, had, in fact, revealed Him as Father to the men to whom He was now giving this model Prayer. Let them think of God as they thought of Him, their Master, with an interest in every man without exception and with love for the lowest and the least and the last.

Does that suggest anything to us who have sometimes said our prayers with no great expectation of their being answered by the God to whom we addressed them? Is our lack of trust not the result of our allowing to drop out of mind and memory the revelation of God which the Author of this Prayer has given us, of forgetting that, throughout the New Testament, God is called, not simply Father, but the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, One whom Jesus Christ revealed, One in whom He personally trusted and in whom He, having revealed Him, invites us to trust?

Let your prayer be the simple, reverent, spontaneous, sincere expression of your heart, He seems to counsel us, and all the while remember that I, in word and deed, have taught you about the God to whom you pray.

3. *But if it is impossible to fail to be impressed by this Prayer's emphasis upon simplicity and sincere trust, it is equally impossible to fail to be impressed by the petitions which it includes and by the order in which they occur.* From the beginning, prayer's chief object has been to ask for something, as it still is. But while our Lord understood that, He indicated the kind of desire a man should express when he prays. His first thoughts, He suggested, should be concerned with God and with his own place in the will of God. Proceeding to consider the needs of his own life, let a man remember, He suggested, that, while he has material needs, he has other and deeper needs which, so long as they remain unsatisfied, create and maintain a dispeace which shadows everything. Furthermore, let him recollect when he prays such a Prayer as the Lord's Prayer, using the first personal pronoun plural—our daily bread, our debts—that others share his needs and that what he asks for himself he must ask for them likewise.

It were wise for all of us, therefore, to lay our prayers alongside this model Prayer and see how they compare. Have our first thoughts been of God? What kind of things have we prayed for for ourselves? And have we included others in our prayers? Prayer, Jesus reminds us, is only prayer when it brings us into conformity to the will of God, when it reminds us of our many needs and of God's power to meet them all, when it stirs our compassion for others and binds us to them with ties of love and loyalty. From such prayer a man cannot but rise stronger and holier, equipped to face anything and everything which life may ask of him.

WHITSUNDAY

Aglow with the Spirit

BY THE REVEREND PRINCIPAL CHARLES S. DUTHIE, D.D., EDINBURGH

'Be . . . fervent in spirit'—Ro 12^{11}.
'Maintain the spiritual glow' (Moffatt).
'Be aglow with the Spirit' (R.S.V.).

That distinguished preacher, Dr. J. H. Jowett, once confessed that his supreme difficulty during his years of training for the ministry was that of keeping his own spiritual life in warmth and vigour. This is a problem for us all. While we may have learnt from experience that being at our best for God need not always be accompanied by a happy feeling inside, we know that there are high levels and low levels; and our ambition is to keep

consistently to the high, in season and out of season. But achievement falls far short of aspiration. The pressure of events, ill-health, the secret battle with ourselves, drag us down. Even to 'walk and not faint' is no small thing. We understand why Dr. Alexander Whyte met the spiritual ecstasy of a younger man with the sobering comment, 'Aye, it's a sair fecht.' Nevertheless, we find something deep within us leaping up in response to Paul's appeal. Because God has laid His hand upon us, we long to be the bearers of a contagious life that will strengthen others and draw them to the God we serve.

How can we maintain the spiritual glow in the service of Christ? There are several preliminary considerations which may help to clear the ground before we consider our text. For one thing, there is a difference between spiritual fervour and spiritual fanaticism. It is what goes *with* our enthusiasm that gives it Christian quality—wisdom, sanity, tolerance. Again, must we not learn to distinguish between the appearance and the reality of warm and vital faith? If the fire is burning within, it will make its presence felt in the look of the eye, the clasp of the hand, the concern we feel and show towards men and women in need. But what matters supremely is that this fire should have been kindled in the heart, the deep self from which all actions flow. Not least, we must have the courage and independence to let our consecration to our Master find its own special forms of expression. The Abbé de Tourville wrote: 'One of the hardest but one of the most absolutely necessary things is to follow our own particular line of development, side by side with souls who have quite a different one, often one opposed to our own.' It would be a dull world if all Christians were alike. God delights in the variety of His saints.

1. We find light being thrown on Paul's words if we look at them, first of all, against the background of the Epistle as a whole. They come almost at the mid-point of the twelfth chapter; and the twelfth chapter itself marks a decisive transition. After he has expounded the great gospel with which he is entrusted and shown the universal sweep of God's purpose of love, Paul comes down with his tremendous 'therefore'—'I beseech you therefore, brethren, *by the mercies of God*, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice. . . .' In other words Christian life and service is the response of our wondering gratitude to God for all that He has done for us through His Son.

We can only be fervent in spirit as we renew our sense of wonder at the unaccountable mercies of God. All Christians, says Reinhold Niebuhr, live by some assurance of grace. How much we owe Him! He has shared His friendship with us. He has called us into His ministry. He has set many open doors of opportunity before us. Devotion grows stronger as we survey our past lives and count the blessings that cannot be explained apart from His Providence. The inner fire is replenished as we meditate on and marvel at the sheer goodness of God.

2. Narrow the context in which our text appears and you will find further light. Take the chapter itself. It is a series of swift, searching, heart-warming, practical exhortations to live the Christian life to the full. Taken together with 1 Co 13 it brings us close to the heart of the Christian ethic. It might well be summed up in Paul's own words 'faith which *worketh* by love' (Gal 5^6). The Christian is nothing if he is not a man of action.

Is it not significant that the charge to maintain the spiritual glow is given precisely at the place where Paul is half-way through a list of practical Christian duties? There are surely two complementary insights here. (*a*) The first is that it is when we are most active, committed, engaged, involved in the Christian service that we are most likely to feel our hearts 'strangely warmed.' Because he is made in the image of God man is essentially a dynamic, self-spending, venturesome creature. He was not made for idleness. We feel close to God when we give ourselves to others, because we are doing as He does. (*b*) Yet there is activity and activity. Perhaps Paul interjected this little phrase because he knew that the activity of the Christian can only be saved from becoming feverish and self-important as it is nourished from resources not its own. The Christian does not generate his own light and heat: he receives them. That brings us to the crux.

3. The final shaft of light that strikes upon these words strikes from within. The Authorised Version translates 'be fervent in spirit,' where 'spirit' almost certainly means 'man's spirit.' Dr. Moffatt's version is a step beyond this, but only a step. When we turn to the Revised Standard Version rendering, however, we are confronted by a different thought. 'Spirit,' bears not a small, but a capital letter. It refers, in fact, to the Spirit of God, the Holy Spirit. The glow of sustained Christian living is made possible by the power of an indwelling presence.

The events of Pentecost stand out from the narrative of the Acts of the Apostles to make it for ever plain to the Church that the end of Christ's life on earth was not an end but a new beginning: the God who showed us His heart in Jesus comes now to change our lives from within by His Spirit. The great message of the Bible, it has been said, is that mortal man can burn with the Divine fire without being consumed. The strange marvel of

New Testament religion is that the infinite God actually enters into the soul of the believer and is felt and known as the secret source of the new life. The spiritual glow is therefore the flow of the Spirit's presence, animating and renewing. How then can the glow be maintained? How can you and I, in fair weather and foul, be at the Christian best? Amiel speaks in his *Journal* of opening our solitude to God. We must learn gently but firmly to keep our entire life open to the invading and pervading influences of the Spirit—our minds to His enlightening, our hearts to His inflaming, our wills to His empowering. Out of His fullness, says John of Christ, we have all received—grace after grace, grace upon grace. That fullness is inexhaustible. Because there was a Pentecost in the history of the Church, that fullness is available through the Spirit. It is for you and for me. Whitsunday is God's invitation to us not simply to celebrate Pentecost but to live it.

Contributions and Comments

The Days of the Son of Man

Referring to Dr. T. F. Glasson's interpretation of Lk 17^{22-37}, supported by the Rev. E. Ashby in The Expository Times, lxvii. 124 [January, 1956], I have the following difficulties.

In what sense can the days of careless ease preceding the Final Judgment be described as the days of the Son of Man? The days of Noah and of Lot were days when these men lived on the earth. But the days of the Son of Man in the theory being considered are not days of the Son of Man's earthly life. Is it then appropriate to call them His days? Besides, the day when Judgment came on men in the time of Noah or Lot cannot be said to be the day of Noah or Lot in the sense in which the Final Judgment can be said to be the day of the Son of Man. Moreover, *v.* 23 suggests that the disciples will desire something yet in the future. 'And they will say to you, Lo, here! or Lo, there! Do not go, do not follow them.'

The idea that the disciples will find the day of the Final Judgment so terrible as to wish to go back to one of the preceding days seems very unlikely. They will hardly want to go back to the dread of the impending calamity and to experience the terrible Final troubles from the beginning, but will rather long for the ending of them.

Luke $17^{26f.}$ tells us that to be preceded by days of careless ease will be true of the days of the Son of Man as it was true of the days of Noah and of Lot. So the days of the Son of Man are not days preceding the Final manifestation, but the days of the Final manifestation itself.

On Mr. Ashby's interpretation I think it possible to conceive the disciples as longing for the days when repentance was still possible, for the sake of others.

W. Powell

Twickenham, Middlesex

'Reward' in Matthew v. 46, etc.

The word lying behind *μισθὸν* in Mt 5^{46} apparently gave some difficulty in translation. The parallel in the next verse is *τί περισσόν* and this is presumably a paraphrase of the same word. Luke's version of the same sayings has regularly *χάρις*. It is likely that this is a further effort to find an equivalent, since both writers seem to be dependent on the same ultimate source, if not on the same document.

Light is thrown on other points in these sayings by a comparison of Matthew and Luke. For instance, Lk 6^{32-34} (recapitulated in *v.* 35) roughly parallels Lk 6^{27-30}. (*V.* 29 is best understood as Luke's comment on *v.* 27: Mt 5^{39-41} stresses the *principle* of suffering patiently by prefacing it with the abrogation of the *lex talionis* and the summary 'But I tell you not to counter an evil.' Luke, by placing the saying after 'Love your enemies' and using the present participle *τύπτοντί* stresses the good of the person who offends.) Thus Lk 6^{34} (cf. *v.* 35) recalls *v.* 30, if we compare the whole structure with Matthew and in particular Lk 6^{30} with Mt 5^{42}. The idea of 'lending' is necessary in Lk 6^{27-30} in order to complete the parallel with Lk 6^{32-34}; this is supplied by Mt 5^{42}=Lk 6^{30}. Here a comparison of the two writers resolves an old difficulty by suggesting that Matthew's 'Give to a beggar and do not turn from a borrower' is nearer the original than Luke's 'Give to [every] one who asks, and do not ask for the return of goods by one who has taken them' (*πᾶς* is a favourite word with the writer of the Third Gospel and has little force).

Like *δανείζω*, *μισθός* also occurs in these two comparative passages, and at significant points. It is reasonable to assume that, whereas Mt $5^{46.\ 47}$= Lk 6^{32-34} implies that those whose standard is no different from that of the godless—publicans, gentiles, sinners—gain no reward, on the other hand, Mt $5^{45.\ 46}$=Lk $6^{35b.\ 36}$ declares what is the reward of 'those who listen' (Lk 6^{27}; the word *μισθός* actually occurs in 6^{35b}: Your *reward* will be great—you will be sons of the Most High).

So 'reward' here denotes a return inevitable in the nature of the case; it is the 'wages' of the Christian as opposed to the barren results of godless

action. This, of course, is the primary meaning of *μισθός*—the sense of rightful earnings, that which is paid back: see MM and especially LS revised, *sub voce*, ii; so also Mt 10[41] and 2 P 2[13. 15], where in the phrase, *μισθός* of unrighteousness, the A.V. translators rendered the same word both as 'reward' and as 'wages.'

In the LXX *μισθός* stands chiefly for שָׂכָר; but thus it is used in Gn 15[1] for the promise of a son to Abraham. In the same sense it is used in Ps 127 (126)[3], where it parallels 'heritage' (*κληρονομία*). This connexion reappears in the First Epistle of Peter, to which it is in these days again possible to turn for gospel reminiscences ('There are remarkable reminiscences of the Synoptic Gospels in this letter' [van Unnik in *New Testament Studies*, ii.]). The words 'not rendering evil for evil or reviling for reviling, but contrariwise blessing, for hereunto were you called, to inherit a blessing' cannot fail to recall Mt 5[39] and [44f.]=Lk 6[27f.] which goes 'Love your enemies, do good to those who hate you, bless those who curse you.' The 'blessing' which we inherit from God is involved in our blessing of those who hate us, as God makes His sun to rise on evil and good, though 1 Peter speaks in terms rather of *imitatio Christi* than of *imitatio Dei* (cf. also 1 P 3[9] with 2[21]).

What the original Aramaic word was we must leave to those who are qualified to speculate. But *μισθός* as 'return' fits the New Testament interpretations and evidence: if the 'reward' is becoming sons of God by imitating His character, it is the true inheriting of His blessing in our own blessing of those who hate us, it is 'doing more' than the ungodly because God is with us, it is the sharing of His 'grace'—which must then mean more than 'thanks.'

E. M. Sidebottom

Owton Manor,
West Hartlepool

Recent Foreign Theology

The Dead Sea Scrolls. Books and articles on the Dead Sea Scrolls continue to pour out. A useful little book has been written by A. Vincent, Emeritus Professor of Strasbourg.[1] He gives a short account of the various finds at Qumran, Murabba'at and Khirbet Mird, but deals principally in the rest of the book with the Qumran finds and the Zadokite Work, which was published by Schechter early this century, and which shows many affinities with the Qumran texts. He gives a translation of the principal non-Biblical texts, and discusses the date of their composition and their historical background. The translation of the Habakkuk Commentary is that already published by Abbé Michel. For the Zadokite Work the author has used an unpublished draft translation by Michel, which was not intended by its author to be published until it had been worked over and revised. As Vincent's book was ready for publication before the full text of the 'Hebrew University Scrolls' was published (the 'St. Mark's Scrolls' also belong to the Hebrew University now) it does not give the full rendering of the Battle Scroll and the Hymns. The major theories as to the history of the sect are reviewed and the author favours the view that the Teacher of Righteousness lived in the Maccabaean period. He accepts the view, which now seems to be solidly established, that the Qumran documents were deposited in the caves shortly before the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. The Essene view of the sect is adopted, and an account of the Essenes as it can be learned from Pliny, Philo, and Josephus is given.

[1] *Les Manuscrits Hébreux du Désert de Juda* [1955] Fayard, Paris; Fr. 700.

Golgotha and the Holy Sepulchre. Professor André Parrot continues to issue his excellent popular studies in the series '*Cahiers d'Archéologie Biblique*' in rapid succession. The sixth volume is well illustrated with plates and plans, and it deals with the site of Golgotha and the Sepulchre of our Lord.[2] The author firmly rejects 'Gordon's Calvary' and the 'Garden Tomb,' and concludes that the traditional location of the tomb is probably correct, though this cannot be stated with certainty. Some other traditional sites—the Tomb of Absalom, the Tomb of Jehoshaphat, the Tomb of St. James and the Tomb of Zechariah—are rejected as legendary. These are all held to go back to a date anterior to the beginning of the Christian era. Professor Parrot is himself a first class archaeologist, and he shows full acquaintance with the work of others on the archaeology of Jerusalem, and especially with the work of the great Dominican scholar, Père Vincent.

[2] *Golgotha et Saint-Sépulchre* [1955]. Delachaux et Niéstle, Neuchâtel; Swiss Fr. 4.50.

Agapē. Studies of Biblical words have been common in recent years, but relatively little attention has been paid to the key-word *ἀγάπη*, to which Father C. Spicq has now devoted a monograph dealing with the New Testament background of the word in Classical Greek, in the Greek of the

Old Testament, and in Judaism.[1] So far as Classical Greek is concerned the study is mainly concerned with the verbs used for ' to love,' since the noun is found only in rare or doubtful texts. It is sometimes affirmed that the word was of Jewish coinage, and was taken over by the Church from this source. While it was mediated to the Church through Judaism, Father Spicq argues that it arose in Egypt, where its use was not confined to Jews, and that it was taken over into the religious vocabulary of the Jews, and thence became also a Christian term. In Classical usage he argues that whereas φιλέω was used for love between equals, ἀγαπάω was used where the parties were not equals. Both verbs have a wide range of meanings, which are carefully examined, and there are appendices on the Hebrew equivalents. The whole is to be commended as a learned and valuable study. Father Spicq thinks the word ἀγάπη should be rendered by ' charity ' rather than by ' love.' As against the not uncommon view that it expresses a spiritual love, and not an emotional sentiment, it should be noted that the verb is used of Samson's passion for Delilah, while the noun ἀγάπησις is used in the LXX of Jer 2^{33} in connexion with prostitution, and the noun ἀγάπη stands frequently in the Song of Songs for the love between a man and a woman. The careful study of the evidence here collected will justify more cautious statements than are sometimes made. It is much to be hoped that the author will pursue his study into the New Testament in a future volume.

Old Testament Prophecy. An unusual study of Hebrew prophecy comes from André Neher, of Strasbourg.[2] The first part is devoted to an examination of non-Israelite prophecy in the ancient world, of which it offers a valuable survey, both as to its extent and as to its character. The main part of the book does not deal with the Old Testament prophets in historical sequence, and indeed some prophets are scarcely mentioned. It starts with a study of the setting of Hebrew prophecy in terms of the dialogue between God and man, of the covenant, and the law, and after a rapid and selective review of the history of prophecy from Abraham to the post-exilic prophets, examines some aspects of the prophetic thought and character. The approach is very original and the thought sometimes elusive—perhaps because it appears in a series of ' Philosophical Essays.' The author will have no setting of the Spirit and the Word in opposition, and rejects the view that the greater pre-exilic prophets repudiated the claim to have the Spirit of God and contented themselves with having His Word. Neher—rightly in my judgment—thinks both belong together. I am not quite sure that I know what he means when he says that it does not matter whether Isaiah thought of Immanuel as the infant Hezekiah or the future Messiah, and appears to regard either interpretation as equally legitimate. In the course of his work he has a number of brief studies of key words of the Old Testament, such as *ruaḥ*, *ḥesedh*, *berith*, none of which are hackneyed repetitions of what will be found elsewhere. This is a book to read and to ponder, and though the reader may want to question a number of things he will do so with a sympathetic appreciation of what he garners from this work.

The Fulfilment of the Law. A Swedish monograph[3] is devoted to the examination of the meaning of ' till all be fulfilled ' in Mt 5^{17}. The author, Dr. H. Ljungman, examines the various views that have been put forward, and is persuaded that something more is meant than the carrying out of the Law, or the coming to pass of anything which finds a place there. He considers the passage in relation to the series of antitheses which follow : ' Ye have heard that it was said . . . but I say unto you,' and concludes that the verb πληρόω here means something like ' perfect.' The ' fulfilment ' of the Law is something that has relation to the coming of Christ, in whom the Law is not set aside but carried forward to a higher stage. From this the author proceeds to consider Mt 3^{15}, where the phrase ' to fulfil all righteousness ' is found. He links the word ' righteousness ' with the sense of ' justify,' going back to the Hebrew צְדָקָה and הִצְדִּיק, and links the baptism of Jesus with the baptism of His death, whereby all sin finds its sufficient cleansing. The author surveys a number of other passages in the course of his discussion, in addition to the principal passages to which he directs attention, and offers an acute and learned contribution to the study of the New Testament.

The God Who Speaks. In the French series of *Cahiers Théologiques* E. Ortigues has published a small work dealing with ' the dialectic of the God revealed—the God concealed,' which is difficult to summarize in a few sentences, despite its brevity.[4] Behind the world is the *Deus absconditus*, who can

[1] *Agapè : Prolégomènes à une Étude de Théologie néo-testamentaire* (*Studia Hellenistica*, No. 10) [1955]. Publications Universitaires de Louvain.

[2] *L'Essence du Prophétisme* (in the series *Épiméthée*) [1955]. Presses Universitaires de France, Paris ; Fr. 900.

[3] *Das Gesetz erfüllen : Matth.* 5, 17 *ff. und* 3, 15 *untersucht* [1954] (Lunds Universitets Årsskrift, N.F. Avd. 1, Bd. 50, No. 6). Gleerup, Lund ; Kr. 14.

[4] *Le Temps de la Parole* [1954]. Delachaux et Niestlé, Neuchâtel ; Swiss Fr. 3.75.

only be known as He breaks His silence and speaks to men and is therefore *Deus revelatus*, but who cannot be wholly known, since He is beyond time and space. In the revelation of the Old Testament He says to Moses אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה, and thus hides Himself even in the act of speaking, whether those words be rendered 'I am what I am' or 'I am who I am,' and the prohibition of any image or representation of God accords with this. In His supreme Word He limits Himself to appear in time and space and flesh as *Deus incarnatus*. When He speaks to man it is about the world and about man's relation to his neighbour. In the Bible this world plays a dual rôle. It is the creation of God and the condition of history; it is also what holds man back from God and in this sense the result of history. Throughout the author contents himself with general propositions, when so much might be said to fill out the content of God's Word, whether in the Old Testament or in the New, and his thought might be illuminated by more of that concreteness which belongs to the Bible.

Pre-Massoretic Hebrew Grammar. An interesting example of international co-operation in scholarship is a work on Hebrew Grammar, written in Hebrew by an Israeli Jew, but published in English by the Spanish Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas.[1] The author, Ze'ev Ben-Ḥayyīm, first examines the pronominal suffix ךָ, which has been held by some scholars to have been originally *-āk*, on the basis of ancient Greek and Latin transcriptions. It is here argued that the Massoretic tradition is reliable, and that the Greek and Latin transcriptions were influenced by Aramaic. The suffix הָ and the verbal affformative תָ are also examined, with similar defence of the Massoretic tradition. The author argues that the *shewa* in יִרְדְּ is silent, though this raises some questions which he does not consider. He has a short section on the pronunciation of Hebrew according to the Dead Sea Scrolls, in which he offers observations on the peculiar forms found there, and concludes by a short essay on the importance of the Samaritan tradition for the understanding of the history of Hebrew and Aramaic, with some specimens of Samaritan pronunciation, and a liturgical poem by Marqe in square Hebrew and transcription, followed by some notes and a translation. There are many vexed questions in the field of pre-Massoretic Hebrew Grammar, and while it can hardly be expected that this book will be accepted as the final solution of those with which it deals, the material it assembles is of value, and its views will be treated with respect even where they are not accepted.

[1] *Studies in the Traditions of the Hebrew Language* [1954]. Instituto 'Arias Montano,' Madrid and Barcelona; 21s.

The Book of Ruth. A pupil of Professor Albright, J. M. Myers, has examined the literary form of the Book of Ruth,[2] and argued that the story was handed down in verse form for many centuries before it was given its present written form. In the vocabulary and syntax he finds traces of its original poetic form. That there are poetic snatches in the speeches of the Book has long been recognized, and this is precisely what we find elsewhere in a number of cases. But this does not involve the conclusion that the whole Book was once in verse, and if it had been cherished in poetic form for centuries it is hard to suppose that when it was written down it would be written in prose. The author sets out the Hebrew text with alleged poetic passages printed in lines, but many of these are not convincing. There is consummate art in the telling of the story of Ruth, which can be recognized without the adoption of this theory, for which insufficient evidence can be provided. At the same time the author is to be thanked for the amount of material on the language of the Book which he has collected, much of which is of interest independently of his theory. H. H. Rowley

Manchester

[2] *The Linguistic and Literary Form of the Book of Ruth* [1955]. Brill, Leiden; Fl. 10.

Entre Nous

The Broadcast Sermon

In preaching there is of necessity a double problem. First, the sermon has to be composed and written; and second, the sermon has to be communicated to men. Each age has had its own special problems of communication; and therefore each age has had to evolve its own technique of communication. Our own age has had to evolve one quite new technique—the technique of the broadcast sermon. That that technique is of the greatest importance is beyond a doubt, when we remember that a service like the People's Service has a listening public of over ten million listeners. That is what makes *An Arrow into the Air*, by the Rev. John H. Withers (James Clarke; 7s. 6d. net) an important book. Mr. Withers is one of that select band of preachers who has been, in the highest sense, outstandingly successful both in the pulpit and on the air.

Mr. Withers has no mean conception of preaching. 'The sermon—ideally at least—is the prophetic application of the Word of Holy Scripture to the needs and tendencies of to-day. . . . At its best a Presbyterian sermon is not just the Minister's views on this and that, but a proclamation of the Gospel of God to the crying needs of this age.'

When we study these sermons we find that they combine two elements in their technique—clarity in their construction, and vividness in their illustration. The volume begins with a sermon on 'Stress and Strain' with Ex 18^{23} in the Moffatt translation as a text: 'If you do this, then you can stand the strain.' First, there is *Relaxation through Prayer*. William James has an essay entitled 'The Energies of Men.' In it he quotes Dr. Hyslop, a famous specialist in diseases of the mind as saying that 'the best sleep-provoking agent which his practice had revealed to him was prayer. I say this, he added, purely as a medical man. The exercise of prayer must be regarded by us doctors as the most adequate and normal of the pacifiers of the mind and calmers of the nerves.' Second, there is *Resignation from Unnecessary Responsibility*. Hezekiah knew the technique of peace when he took the threatening letter and spread it out before the Lord. Once when Bishop Quayle was lying awake one night worrying, he heard God say to him: 'Quayle, you go to sleep; I'll sit up for the rest of the night.' Third, there is *Recreation through Worship*. The head of a large hospital had an exhausting time during an epidemic, when her staff was short. 'One day she said to a subordinate: "I'm all in. I must consult a nerve specialist or"—and she did not know why she said it—"or else go to Church."' She did go to Church and there she found her peace.

There is a sermon on 'True Realism,' which deals with the things of which life really consists (Lk 12^{15}). First, *A man's life does not consist in possession, but in being possessed*. Dean Wicks of Harvard said: 'The sign that a boy has passed out of his childish stage and has become a man lies in the discovery of some important enterprise, concerning which he says, I belong to that.' That reaches its peak when a man can say: 'I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.' Second, life consists *not in Prestige but in Purpose*. Man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy Him for ever. In the Aristotelian sense that is man's *telos*, his function in life. Thirdly, a man's life consists *not in Proficiency but in Personal Relationships*. As Martin Buber has said: 'Real life is meeting.'

Again and again Mr. Withers seizes on the memorable quotation. Aldous Huxley defined our modern progress as: 'Improved means for unimproved ends.' William Temple said that it was as if a burglar had broken into the world's shop; but, instead of stealing the articles for sale, he changed the price tickets, so that the goods which are really valuable are marked at a cheap price, and the shoddy, worthless things suddenly appeared very expensive and highly desirable. John Ruskin wrote: 'I'd rather live in a cottage and wonder at everything than live in Warwick Castle and wonder at nothing.' In Gerald Healy's play *The Black Stranger* the scene is set in the famine days of 1846. As part of the relief work men were set to making roads. Michael, the son, comes home one evening and says with poignant sorrow to his father: 'They're makin' roads that lead to nowhere.' That was tragedy, and that is so often the tragedy of human endeavour.

There is in this book skill in unforgettable sermon construction, width and catholicity in the selection of illustrative material, combined with patent sincerity. There is gospel in these sermons, and that is no doubt the reason why the arrow in them did not fall uselessly to earth but lodged its truth in some one's heart. WILLIAM BARCLAY

Christian Ethics

Any book from the pen of Dietrich Bonhoeffer will be treasured as the testament of a confessor and martyr. His treatise on *Ethics* (S.C.M.; 21s. net) bears the marks of his struggle against the iniquities of the Hitler régime, alike in its unfinished state, and in the illustrations drawn naturally from the actual situation at the time of its composition. The book opens with a cry of distress at 'the failure of *reasonable* people to perceive either the depths of evil or the depths of the holy.' 'It is worse for a liar to tell the truth than for a lover of truth to lie.' 'If evil appears in the form of light, beneficence, loyalty, renewal . . . then this, if it is understood straightforwardly, is a clear additional proof of its abysmal wickedness. But the moral theorist is blinded by it.' The discussion of suicide provides another example of the pressure of totalitarian tyranny on the mind of the writer. Is suicide ever permissible for a Christian? Bonhoeffer was not convinced of the case for euthanasia, but 'if a prisoner takes his life for fear that under torture he may betray his country, his family, or his friend . . . then the self-killing is so strongly subject to the motive of sacrifice that it will be impossible to condemn the deed.'

The book deals with foundations and superstructure. The foundations are well and truly laid but Bonhoeffer did not live to complete the superstructure. His fundamental position might be characterised as Christian Existentialism. If the Existentialist starts from the fact that we exist as responsible beings, in a world of physical objects and living creatures and in a society of other persons,

the Christian adds that we exist in relation to Christ. 'The world is relative to Christ, no matter whether it knows or not.' We exist in the physical universe, in human society and in Christ. Only as we realize our existence in Christ can we exist in a right relation both to Nature and to society. God in Christ created, God in Christ loves, condemns and redeems the world and the social order. The Incarnation means that God has taken upon Himself the full reality of humanity, the Cross means that God had taken upon Himself the full burden of man's guilt. The Resurrection is the revelation of God's renewing and recreating power. Ethics for the Christian is conformation to Christ. We are to love our fellow-men as Christ has loved them and us. The foundation is not a moral code, based on the Sermon on the Mount, nor yet an *imitatio Christi*, but a response to what God in Christ has done for us men. What is God's will for me in this concrete situation? What would Christ have me to do? These are the questions uppermost in the Christian mind, not, What is the nature of the good life? How can I do good, or be good?

We may fail as Christians by being over anxious to keep ourselves unspotted from the world, as well as by treating normal obligations, such as telling the truth, as absolutes. Every blurter would do well to read the closing pages on 'What is meant by telling the truth.' Responsible action will be determined, not by some moral code but by dwelling on what we owe to Christ. Yet certain spheres of human interest and activity—labour and culture, marriage and the family, government and the Church—are subject to Divine mandates, have to fulfil divinely imposed tasks or purposes. These we must understand and accept.

In the detailed discussion of these themes, Bonhoeffer's Lutheran inheritance is much in evidence, and part of the value of the book lies in the insight it affords into the Lutheran mind of to-day. To many British readers, some of Bonhoeffer's judgments will seem too conservative, though he repudiates 'the pseudo-Lutheran Christ who exists only for the purpose of sanctioning the facts as they are.' His conviction that the relation of 'superior-inferior' is something God-ordained—in labour, in the family, in government and in the Church—will come as a challenge to the egalitarianism with which so many in the West so easily identify Christianity.

But what shall we make of this judgment? 'The greatness of British statesmen, and I am thinking here, for example, of Gladstone, is that they acknowledge the law as the ultimate authority: and the greatness of German statesmen—I am thinking now of Bismarck—is that they come before God in free responsibility. . . . In this neither can claim to be superior to the other. Neither can be the judge of the other. It is always for God to judge.' Yes, it is always for God, not for us, to judge: yet it is difficult to suppress the conviction that Bismarck would have been a greater statesman, if in his responsibility before God he had not been quite so free, if he had been more willing to acknowledge the law as the ultimate authority.

H. G. Wood

---

2 Corinthians x. 12

'If ever you go to London, you must be sure to go to Trafalgar Square—the great square with the monument of Lord Nelson standing in the middle of it, and the stone lions crouching, and the fountains playing, and the fat pigeons strutting about the pavement, waiting to be fed by boys and girls. And you must be sure to see something else that is missed by most people who go to Trafalgar Square. It's a strip of brass let into the stone on the National Gallery side of the Square. It is the official measure—so that if you were ever in doubt about it, you could go and find out for certain. There wouldn't be any use in arguing about it—that two feet make a yard, for instance—*because once and for all the reliable measure has been set up*.

'I wonder if you have ever thought about that when you are busy measuring yourself? I don't, of course, mean just measuring the distance from the soles of your feet to the top of your head.

'The truth, none the less, is that we are always measuring ourselves. The New Testament speaks of some silly people who were always "measuring themselves by themselves, and comparing themselves among themselves" (2 Corinthians 10^{12}).

'You can see, can't you, that that's a silly thing to do? It's just as silly for you or me to measure ourselves by our friends, or by our class-mates, or by the people we don't like, and say, "I'm as good as she is," or "I'm a lot nicer than he is." The only true measure of kindness and niceness and courage, of course, is Jesus Christ. He is the only reliable measure for the whole world. And the thing we've got to do is to stop measuring ourselves by ourselves, or by other people, and *measure up to Him*—to what our New Testament calls "*the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.*"'

This quotation is from Rita F. Snowden's *Over the Hills and Home Again* (Epworth Press; 5s. net), a book which contains thirty-three of her talks to boys and girls. A few of these talks originally appeared in The Expository Times. The others are just as good.

Printed in Scotland by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.